Chicago Theological Seminary
Hammond Library

SAMUEL IVES CURTISS COLLECTION.

ACCESSION NO. 22004

CLASS BS
BOOK VOL. 5
c.3

Samuel Ives Curtiss
Library
Old Testament Theology
Number 2132
Chicago.

GRANDATIONE VINCIMUS.

These be ye Coat Armoury
by ye name of Curteis
who were wort hie in their
tyme and in their defense.
God thaim defended.

Date Due

L. B. Cat. No. 1137

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/bibliotheca-sacra_1848_5

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

AND

THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

CONDUCTED BY

B. B. EDWARDS AND E. A. PARK,

Professors at Andover,

WITH THE SPECIAL CO-OPERATION OF

DR. ROBINSON AND PROF. STUART.

VOL. V.

NEW YORK AND LONDON:
JOHN WILEY.
ANDOVER:
WILLIAM H. WARDWELL.
1848.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1848, by
WILLIAM H. WARDWELL,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Massachusetts.

BS
v.5
c.3

CONTENTS OF VOL. V.

NO. XVII.

Article. Page.

I. TOUR FROM BEIRÛT TO ALEPPO IN 1845, ... 1

By Rev. W. M. Thomson, Missionary at Beirût.

II. THE STUDY OF GREEK AND ROMAN LITERATURE WITH REFERENCE TO THE PRESENT TIMES, . . 23

By Charles Siedhof, Ph. D., late Rector of the Gymnasium at Aurich, in the Kingdom of Hanover, now teacher of a private Classical School, Newton Centre. Ms.

III. STUDIES IN HEBREW POETRY, ... 58

By Prof. B. B. Edwards.

Age of the Alphabetical Poems, ... 58
Rhyme in Hebrew Popular Poetry, ... 62
Explanation of the word סֶלָה, Selah, ... 66
General Observations, ... 66
Jewish Tradition, ... 66
Hellenistic Interpretations, ... 67
Recent Explanations of the Word, ... 68
Masoretic Text, ... 71
Views of Sommer, ... 72

IV. NOTES ON BIBLICAL GEOGRAPHY, ... 79

By E. Robinson, D. D., Professor at New York.

I. Abila of Lysanias. The Inscriptions, ... 79
II. Chalcis, ... 90
III. Great Inscription at Apamea, ... 91
Topography of Jerusalem, ... 92

V. ANALYSIS OF THE ARGUMENT IN THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS, ... 97

By Prof. H. B. Hackett, Newton Theol. Institution.

VI. RECENT WORKS IN METAPHYSICAL SCIENCE, . . . 102

By Noah Porter, Professor of Moral Philosophy and Metaphysics, Yale College.

22004

VII. JEROME AND HIS TIMES, ... 117

By Rev. Samuel Osgood, Providence, R. I.

VIII. JOURNAL OF A VISIT TO THE YEZIDEES, WITH A DESCRIPTION OF THE EXCAVATIONS AT KHORSABAD, ... 148

By Rev. Thomas Laurie, American Missionary in the East.

IX. REVIEW OF RECENT EDITIONS OF CLASSICAL AUTHORS, ... 171

Furnished by an Association of Teachers.

X. MISCELLANIES.—THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY, . 192

By Prof. B. B. Edwards.

University of Cambridge, England, ... 192
The Sorbonne at Paris, ... 194
Other Colleges in Paris, ... 195
Means for Oriental Study in Paris, ... 198
Journal of the American Oriental Society, ... 201

NO. XVIII.

I. THE PELAGIAN CONTROVERSY.—A HISTORICAL ESSAY, ... 205

By Prof. Philip Schaff, Mercersburg, Pa.

Introduction, ... 205
I. Pelagius and Augustine.—Their Life and Character, . . 207
II. External History of the Controversy, ... 211
III. Inward History of the Controversy, ... 216
§ 1. The Doctrine of Freedom and the Primitive State, . 217
§ 2. The Doctrine of the Fall and its Consequences, . . 221
§ 3. The Doctrine of Grace and Redemption, . . . 233

II. TOUR FROM BEIRÛT TO ALEPPO IN 1845, . . . 243

By Rev. W. M. Thomson, Missionary at Beirût. [Concluded from No. 17, p. 23.]

Tortosa or Tartoos, ... 247
Ruad or Arvad, ... 251
Jebilee or Gebilee, ... 258

III. DE WETTE'S COMMENTARY ON ROMANS 5: 12—19, . 263

Translated by M. Stuart, Professor at Andover.

IV. THE PRODUCE OF THE VINEYARD IN THE EAST, . 283

By Rev. Henry Homes, American Missionary at Constantinople.

V. REVIEW OF CHASE'S EDITION OF THE APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS, ... 296

VI. INTERPRETATION OF PSALM LXVIII, ... 312

By Wm. W. Turner, Hebrew Instructor in the Union Theol. Sem., New York.

Introduction, ... 312
Argument, ... 314
Translation, ... 316
Comment, ... 318
Occasion and Date, ... 337

VII. OF THE DIVINE AGENCY IN THE PRODUCTION OF MATERIAL PHENOMENA, ... 342

By George I. Chace, Prof. of Chemistry and Geology, Brown University.

VIII. THE ADVANCEMENT OF SOCIETY IN KNOWLEDGE AND VIRTUE, ... 358

By Prof. B. B. Edwards.

IX. GREEK TRANSLATION OF PSALM CXXXVII, . . 375

X. MISCELLANIES AND CORRESPONDENCE, . . . 378

Munich—the City and University, ... 378
Bibliothéque Royale, now National Library at Paris, . . . 383
Literary and Theological Institutions in Edinburgh, . . . 385
British Museum 388

NO. XIX.

I. DEPRESSION OF THE DEAD SEA AND OF THE JORDAN VALLEY, ... 397

By E. Robinson, D. D., Professor at New York.

II. ALLEGED ANACHRONISM IN ACTS 5: 36 IN RELATION TO THE SEDITION OF THEUDAS, ... 409

From the German by H. B. Hackett, Professor at Newton.

III. REMARKS ON A PASSAGE IN PLATO'S GORGIAS, . 431

By T. D. Woolsey, Yale College.

IV. HÄVERNICK'S INTRODUCTORY REMARKS TO HIS COMMENTARY ON EZEKIEL, ... 434

Translated from the German by Edward Robie, Resident Licentiate, Theol. Seminary, Andover.

§ 1. Circumstances of the Life of Ezekiel, ... 435
2. Personal Character of Ezekiel, ... 438
3. Style and Method of Ezekiel, ... 442
4. Composition of the Book, ... 444

V. TRAVELS IN NORTHERN SYRIA. DESCRIPTION OF SELEUCIA, ANTIOCH, ALEPPO, ETC., ... 447

By Rev. William M. Thomson, American Missionary in Syria.

VI. THE ORATIONS OF THUCYDIDES, ... 481

Translated from the German by John W. Mears, A. M., Student in Philosophy and the Arts at Yale College.

Introductory Remarks, ... 481
§ 1. Great number of the Speeches of Thucydides, . . . 483
2. Preliminary Inquiries upon the Relation of the Speeches of Thucydides to those really delivered, ... 485
3. True Relation of the Speeches of Thucydides to those really delivered, ... 487
4. Arrangement of the Speeches, ... 492
5. Conclusion, ... 495

VII. MÜLLER'S CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF SIN, . . . 499

By Edward Robie, Resident Licentiate, Theol. Seminary, Andover.

§ 1. Nature of Sin, ... 500
2. The Guilt of Sin, ... 507

VIII. DAVIDSON'S ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY, . . . 513

IX. THE RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE OF LUTHER IN THE CLOISTER OF ERFURT, ... 519

By B. Sears, D. D., President of Newton Theol. Institution.

The Bible, ... 520
Luther becomes Monk, ... 521
Luther in the Cloister, ... 525
Taking the Vow.—Second year in the Cloister, 1506, . . . 533
He studies the Scholastic Theology, ... 540
Preparation for the Priesthood, ... 541
Consecration as Priest in 1507, ... 543

X. TRANSLATION OF THE PROPHECY OF NAHUM WITH NOTES, ... 551

By Prof. B. B. Edwards.

Introductory Remarks, ... 551
Nineveh and the Assyrian Empire, ... 554
Time in which the Prophecy was delivered, ... 556
Native Place of Nahum, ... 557
Style and Manner of Nahum, ... 558
General Outline of the Argument, ... 560
Translation, ... 562
Notes, ... 566

XI. EARLY HISTORY OF THE ORDER OF JESUITS IN FRANCE, ... 576

XII. REMARKS ON INSCRIPTIONS, ... 586

XIII. LITERARY AND THEOLOGICAL MISCELLANIES, . 593

NO. XX.

I. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC RELIGION IN ITALY, . . 597

By B. B. Edwards, Professor at Andover.

II. REMARKS ON A SERMON DELIVERED BY THE LATE DR. EMMONS OF FRANKLIN BEFORE THE NORFOLK EDUCATION SOCIETY, DORCHESTER, JUNE 11, 1817, 625

By Rev. Leonard Withington, Newbury, Ms.

III. OF SPIRIT AND THE CONSTITUTION OF SPIRITUAL BEINGS, ... 633

By George I. Chace, Prof. of Chemistry and Geology, Brown University.

IV. THE RELATION OF LANGUAGE TO THOUGHT, . . 650

By W. G. T. Shedd, Professor of English Literature, University of Vermont.

V. JOURNEY FROM ALEPPO TO MOUNT LEBANON BY JEBLE EL-AALA, APAMIA, RIBLA, ETC., ... 663

By Rev. William M. Thomson, American Missionary in Syria.

VI. COMMENTARY ON THE VISION OF EZEKIEL INTRODUCTORY TO HIS PROPHECY, ... 700

By the late Professor Hävernick. Translated from the German by Edward Robie, Assistant Instructor in Hebrew, Theol. Seminary, Andover.

VII. NEW EDITION OF PLUTARCH'S LIVES, . . . 726

VIII. SCHOTT'S TREATISE ON THE STRUCTURE OF A SERMON, ... 731

By Edwards A. Park, Professor at Andover.

1. Importance of a regular Plan for a Sermon, ... 731
2. Remarks on the different Kinds of the Introduction, . . . 732
3. Subject-matter of the Introduction, ... 734
4. General Rules for the Introduction, ... 735
5. The Proposition, ... 737
6. The Transition, ... 739
7. The Partition, ... 741
8. Conclusion, ... 745

IX. REMARKS ON THE CHINESE LANGUAGE, . . . 751

Letter from an American Missionary in China.

X. NOTES ON BIBLICAL GEOGRAPHY, ... 770

By E. Robinson, D. D., Professor at New York.

I. Notes on the Route from Beirût to Damascus, . . . 760
II. The Dead Sea Expedition, ... 764

XI. NOTICE OF NEW EDITIONS OF CLASSICS, . . . 771

By an Association of Gentlemen.

XII. REVIEW OF OWEN'S THUCYDIDES, ... 777

By James Hadley, Assistant Professor of Greek in Yale College.

XIII. LITERARY AND THEOLOGICAL MISCELLANIES, . 786

Age of Literary Men, ... 786
German Conversations-Lexicon, ... 788
New Latin Lexicon, ... 790
Literary Institutions in Switzerland, ... 791

INDEX, ... 797

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

AND

THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

NO. XVII.

FEBRUARY, 1848.

ARTICLE I.

TOUR FROM BEIRÛT TO ALEPPO IN 1845.[1]

By Rev. W. M. Thomson, Missionary at Beirût.

WITHIN the last few years Palestine has been traversed in all directions by travellers from Europe and America, who have in various ways given to the public the result of their discoveries. Northern Syria however has been rarely visited, and but comparatively little is known in regard to it. This fact will probably be regarded by oriental students as a sufficient apology for publishing the following brief journal of a tour through this interesting country.

Oct. 16*th*, 1845. In company with Capt. Newbold of the East India service I left Beirût this afternoon at 3 o'clock, on a tour to Aleppo. A ride of half an hour through rich mulberry orchards brought us to Nahr Beirût—the Magoras of Strabo and Pliny—which we crossed on a substantial stone bridge of seven arches. My companion examined, with some curiosity, the remains of a very ancient building, of Roman brick, which has for many ages marked the spot where St. George killed the Dragon. Leaving the lovers of legendary lore to discuss the rival claims between this and twenty other sites, for the honor of this wonderful combat, we pass on our way around the deep bay of St. George. The path lies along the soft sea beach, and the feathery surf of the light summer breeze tumbles harmlessly over the

[1] A similar tour in 1840 is described by Mr. Thomson in the Missionary Herald for 1841, p. 28, etc.

feet of your horse. From N. Beirût to N. Antelias[1] is one hour, and as much further to Nahr el-Kelb—or Dog river—the Lycus of the ancients. Remarkable on many accounts is this little river. Between lofty ramparts of perpendicular rock, it leaps boldly down from snow-clad Sunnîn into the Mediterranean. Its southern rampart projects into the sea, forming a bold, rough promontory, along whose overhanging brow, a narrow and slippery path has been cut out of the solid rock by "men of other days." This remarkable pass was once defended by a gate in the narrowest part, the remains of which are still visible, including a granite column with a Greek inscription too much effaced to be copied. A few rods further on are the Egyptian and Persian figures cut in relief on the face of the rock. I see the name of Sesostris constantly coupled with one of these figures, and shall not attempt to disturb the relation. The origin of the winged globe overshadowing youth acting Egyptian gymnastics is not to be mistaken, and the inscriptions in the arrow-headed character are undoubtedly Persian. Further on and lower down are two Latin inscriptions which may be read in Burckhardt and many other travellers. Near the foot of the present bridge is a very long Saracenic inscription, so involved that our Arab scholars are not able to decipher it. Men of all ages and dynasties have been ambitious to leave some memento of their existence at this remarkable spot. The pass is about half a mile long, rough and rocky and disagreeable in the extreme to a timid rider. The river is always fordable except in very rainy weather, and for such times there is a good stone bridge of three arches erected by the Emeer Bshire.

About six miles above the bridge a large part of the river flows out of a cavern; and there are two other caves further up the valley. Across the interior and lower extremities of these caves the river glides darkly, and disappearing beneath the mountain bursts out finally at the mouth of the lowest cavern. These caves are well worth visiting.[2] The real sources of the river are the great fountains, Neba el-Âsil and Neba el-Lebn, some fifteen miles further up the mountain. A few rods below N. el-Lebn the river flows under a magnificent natural bridge; and then fretting and foaming through, over and

[1] Is the village, *Antelias*, which is prettily situated about a mile east of the road where the N. Antelias bursts through the rocky barrier of the hills into the plain, the modern representative of the Leontos mentioned by Strabo as between Beirût and the river Lycus? Here are, and probably always were, the mills which mainly supply Beirût with flour. This of itself would make it a place of importance. The shipping in the bay also water from Antelias.

[2] For a full account of these caverns by Mr. Thomson, see Missionary Herald, 1841, p. 31.—Eds.

amongst huge rocks it leaps from a giddy precipice into the valley below,—a beautiful but solitary cascade in the heart of these mountains. This natural bridge is one of the largest in the world. The span of its noble and finely turned arch is 163 feet. The elevation above the stream is from 70 to 80 feet, and the width on the top varies from 120 to 160 feet. The rock is 30 feet thick in the centre of the arch, and much thicker at the abutments. The public road passes over the top, which Mr. Wildenbruh, the Prussian consul general, ascertained to be 4926 feet above the sea. No traveller should fail to explore Dog river. The ride to this natural curiosity by Ajeltoon and Fareiyeh is one of the most romantic in all Lebanon.

Two or three miles south-west of this bridge are the ruins of a temple of Grecian architecture called Fukrah. It faces the east, and measures 110 feet by 55. The walls are partly standing, but the columns are all prostrate. They are plain shafts of limestone with Corinthian capitals. Fragments of a Greek inscription are found on broken pieces of cornice, but they cannot be collected into an intelligible record. There are considerable ruins as of a town in the vicinity; and on a hill forty or fifty rods to the north stands an isolated tower of singular construction. What remains, appears to be only the basement, nearly solid and without any arch. Probably there were upper stories on this very substantial base. The prospect from the top down the gorge and over mountain and valley to the distant sea at Beirût is magnificent. The water of Neba el-Lebn is still conducted over the hill to the temple, but it now only waters the plantations around it. Who built this temple, tower and city, and when, it is impossible to ascertain. Every trace of the inhabitants who could have required such a place of worship has long since vanished from Lebanon. There is an illegible inscription over the door of the tower, and on a stone near it is the following, cut in large well-marked characters.

ΛΕΝΤΕΠΙΘΟΛΟΝ
ΡΑΒΒΟΜΟΥΕΠΙΜΕ
ΛΗΤΟΥΕΚΤωΝΤΟΥ
ΜΕΠξΤΟΥΘΕΟΥωΚΟΛΟ
ΜΗΘΗ

In two hours from N. el-Kelb we reached Maamelteîn, a collection of Khans at the extreme north-east corner of the bay of Jûneh. The wady of this place and name divides the districts of Kesrawân and Jebail; and here is seen the best specimen of a Roman bridge in Syria. It is a single arch whose span is 38 feet 4 inches, the width 23 feet 9 inches, and the heighth 26 feet. Some of the stones are 10 feet long by 3 thick. The whole fabric has a bold, substantial appear-

ance worthy of the hands that reared it. The bridge is now utterly useless since the water in the wady is never a foot deep. As the road must of necessity pass this spot on account of the perpendicular cliff on the north of it, the bridge was probably designed to protect the ford from the sea, when the west wind blew violently. In the course of ages the detritus brought down from the mountain by the brook has encroached upon the sea, so as to leave sufficient room for the road between it and the bridge. Such encroachments are common along this coast. The Nahr el-Mote, near Beirût has pushed back the line of the shore many rods within the last ten years.

We slept on the Roman bridge, and left Maamelteîn at sunrise. For the first half hour the road is carried along a very rocky and narrow pass overhanging the northern shore of Jûneh bay. Burj Kseîbeh, one of St. Helena's towers, stands in lonely desolation on the extreme point of the low cape which protects the bay on the north. Rising to the top of a hill of highly stratified argillaceous marl, we stopped to gaze upon and admire the glorious panorama around the head of this beautiful bay. The mountain rises abruptly from the shore some thousand feet, clothed with dark groves, its sides adorned with hanging villages, and its dizzy summits crowned with white convents. Ghuzîr is the largest of these hamlets and is distinguished by its Jesuit's college and large silk factory. Descending to the shore at a small village called Berjeh, we came in one hour to a wide stairway cut through the solid rock, down to a stream of fresh water which flows into the sea some twenty feet below the surface. It is called Mahûz, and is resorted to by all the neighboring shepherds to water their flocks and herds. There is a great scarcity of water along this coast, and what is found is brackish. The scarcity of fountains admits of the following explanation. For more than twenty miles the strata near the sea dips towards it, at all angles from 90° and downwards. The water is consequently carried below the surface. It frequently comes out *in* the sea where the strata terminate abruptly. These *uptilted* strata form the most striking peculiarity in the geology of lower Lebanon. They are frequently a thousand feet high and double that in thickness, and may be traced by the naked eye for fifteen miles from a single position near Beirût. They are always accompanied by a scarcity of fountains.

Between Mahûz and Nahr Ibrahim is a village called es-Sûfreh whose ancient ruins have for ages served as a quarry for Beirût and other cities on the coast. The rock is composed almost wholly of well preserved fossil shells. Nahr Ibrahim is about two hours from Maamelteîn. The bridge over the river is a single arch 63½ feet span

and 36 feet above the water—said to have been built by the Emeer Ibrahim, nephew of Mar Yohanna Marone. This would carry its construction back to the eleventh century. Mar Yohanna Marone must not be confounded with Mar Marone the founder of the Maronite sect. The river however obtained its modern name from this Emeer Ibrahim. As the blood of Adonis has long ceased to colour the water, the very name of the beautiful bay has been forgotten by the modern inhabitants on the banks of this classical stream. The source of the Nahr Ibrahim is a large fountain high up in Lebanon flowing from a cave near Afka. This is probably the Aphaca which Zozimus says was midway between Baalbeck and Jebeil and where was the temple of Venus so celebrated for its impure and abominable rites. The ruins still found near the cave may mark the precise spot of this temple, and the locality is well adapted to such a purpose. A magnificent rampart of rock, a thousand feet perpendicular height, incloses the secluded spot on two sides, while the horrible gorge of the river renders access from below nearly impossible. The road from Baalbeck to Jebeil was probably carried over the southern end of Sunnîn, and around the head of the impracticable gorges of N. el-Kelb and N. Ibrahim. It would thus pass near Fukrah as well as Afka; and were it not for the identity of name, I should place the temple of Venus at Fukrah. The one may as justly be called "midway between Baalbeck and Jebeil" as the other, while the great temple at Fukrah is without a history, and Afka has no ruined temple.[1]

One hour from N. Ibrahim is another of Helena's towers called Mehash, famed over the country for its echo. The response to a person standing about forty rods from it, is absolutely perfect in tone, emphasis and pronunciation. Several of our company had their impertinent addresses returned to them so promptly as to confound their most determined gravity. Here is a khan and some very ancient ruins, and the water of N. Ibrahim was once conducted to it by a stone aqueduct which can still be traced most of the distance along the brow of the hill above the road. *Palaebiblos*, mentioned by Strabo in connection with the Adonis must have been somewhere in this neighborhood. The ruins are on the banks of a wady called Fedâr, which is

[1] Dr. Hogg believes that he discovered the ruins of the temple of Afka at lake Leman. This is not very probable. The road from Baalbeck to Jebeil by lake Leman would not come near Afka. Leman also has a *name* and a history of its own in olden time, and claimed no connection with Afka and its temple. As it was destroyed in the time of Constantine, it is not strange that but little of the ruins remain.

spanned by a bridge of one arch with the name of Jior Jadge. A broken column lies on the end of this bridge having the following inscription, remarkable on account of the name of *ZHNOBIA*, Palmyra's glorious queen.

+ + + ω Π + + +
A N Θ Υ Π (Δ I
A N Є I K H T ω (Є B A (T ω
K A I (Є Π T I ∪ A Z H N O B I A
(B A Є T H 7 H T P I T O Υ
T O Υ A H T T H T O Υ H
K P A T ∪ P O Є O Υ A B A M A
A Θ H N O Δ ω P O Υ

The inscription is much injured by time, but most of the letters are quite distinct.

It is forty minutes ride from Jior Jadge to Jebeil. We examined the ruined church called Marteen or Mar Tîn about a mile south of the city. Tradition carries its origin back to a very high ecclesiastical antiquity, nor do its architectural indications clash with these claims.

The road thus far has followed the sea-shore along the base of the lower hills of Lebanon. The strata dip towards the sea at an angle varying from 10° to 30°. The formation most common is indurated white marl alternating with strata of semi-chrystalline cretaceous rock. It is highly fossiliferous, and in many places is *interlaced* with *seams* of *dark chert*. These are often disposed with as much regularity as the mortar and brick in a wall, to which it bears no slight resemblance. North of Nahr Ibrahim the shore and adjacent fields are covered with black volcanic sand, gravel and pebbles, often cemented into a tough salt-and-pepper conglomerate. As there is no locality of trap on the neighboring hills and no river to bring this sand from a distance, there is probably an extensive submarine dyke of trap near the shore. I noticed in many places a thick stratum of dark conglomerate, composed of sand and *recent* shells, water worn and comminuted, overlying *unconformably* the limestone, and twenty or thirty feet above the water. This indicates, either that the sea has retired, or that there has been a recent (geologically speaking) rise of the coast.

Jebeil is the ancient Byblus of the Greeks.[1] Benjamin of Tudela, by one of his courageous leaps into the dark abyss of antiquity,

[1] The *Gebal* of the Hebrews, inhabited by seamen and builders, Ezek. 27: 9. Hence were the Giblites, 1 K. 5: 18 margin.—Eds.

discovered that it was the Gebal of the children of Ammon. It had in his days 200 Jews—probably a cypher too many by mistake,—as must have happened in the manuscript of Volney, A. D. 1786, where he gives the number of inhabitants at 6000. For ages the number has not exceeded 600, and there are no Jews. It was however a place of some importance during the crusades, and was governed, when Benjamin visited it, by seven Genovese Emeers of the family of Embriaco, the chief of whom was Julianus.

The most remarkable thing about Jebeil is the multitude of granite columns which are built into the walls and castles, choke up the small harbour, and lie scattered over the fields. Beautiful sarcophagi are also frequently dug out of the ruins. One was found quite recently of the most exquisite workmanship, and with a Greek inscription. It had never been opened, and consequently the bones of its original tenant were found in it. I have seen the rings, bracelets, and gold leaf which covered the face, and several other ornaments, found amongst the bones. It is to be regretted that these admirable specimens of ancient art are generally broken to fragments by the inhabitants to get them out of the way, or to serve for building their houses and garden walls.

The columns are mostly of gray granite—plain shafts varying in length from ten to twenty feet and in diameter from one to two feet. The style is Grecian, and this applies to all the columns in the cities of ancient Phenicia. Had the Phenicians therefore no columns of their own? Did they import their style from Greece? Or did both borrow from Egypt? The granite probably all came from the banks of the Nile, as there is no granite in Syria, and much of it can be proved to have come from Egyptian quarries. Were there no such columns in Syria before the conquest of Alexander? The fact that innumerable columns were incorporated into temples, castles and piers known to be of the age of Augustus, proves that they had *then* become fragments of *ancient* ruins. But this might well happen in a country so subject as Syria to destructive earthquakes and political convulsions; even if their introduction was subsequent to the Grecian conquest. I have seen no ruins in this country into which broken columns are incorporated that can prefer any claims to a remoter antiquity than the times of the elder Ptolemies. My architectural knowledge however is far too limited to discuss these questions; nor have I access to authors more learned in this matter: and as these cold, rigid, but beautiful creations of races long extinct, will not reveal their age or their history to such a tyro as myself, some more skilful antiquary must put them to the question.

Another object of interesting inquiry to the traveller is the age of

the castle. That part of it which appears most ancient is constructed entirely of large and finely *beveled* stones. These seem never to have been disturbed; and if the *bevel* characterizes the Phenician architecture we have here a good specimen of this most ancient order. The fact that there are in this part neither columns nor fragments of any kind countenances the idea that it is a portion of the original castle. The Romans evidently built extensively around this primitive nucleus. Granite columns abound in these portions, and the whole appears to have been constructed out of fragmentary materials found on the spot at the time of its erection. The lighter works are Saracenic and Arabic. The crusaders may have also made additions and repairs; and the large church in the city is said to have been built by them. Perhaps it owes its origin to the piety of some of the Embriaco Emeers. The castle was occupied, by a detachment of Ibrahim Pasha's troops in 1840, and a number of British soldiers were wounded, and some killed in an ill-directed attack made upon it.

From Jebeil to Amsheet is one hour. The village is on a hill east of the road, and is distinguished by ancient ecclesiastical ruins—a convent, two churches and a subterraneous, cavernous chapel still used, and sacred to St. Sophia. The churches are dedicated to St. George and our Lady Mary. There are many tombs hewn in the rock which resemble the Phenician sepulchres near Tyre; and I found a long inscription on a slab recently dug out of the ruins, in a character which we could not decipher. It was much injured and some of the letters seemed to be Arabic, and others resembled the old Syriac. The tradition is, that these ruins belonged to a Syriac Patriarchate which was destroyed when the Moslems first conquered the country. Half an hour north of Amsheet is a place called el-Bârbârâ, and on the hill above it a solitary tower named Rehân. Abrupt hills, rocks, indentations of the shore and yawning caverns render the road in this neighborhood quite picturesque. A deep cut ravine called Medfoor divides the district of Jebeil from that of Batrone, one hour from the latter place. The distance between these two cities is four hours.

Batrone is believed to be the Botrus of the Greeks, nor is there any reason to question their identity. It now contains about 3000 inhabitants, four-fifths of whom are Maronites—the remainder are Arab Greeks. There is no family of hereditary, feudal chiefs residing in this district, *el-hamd lillah* (praise be to God), as one of the inhabitants concluded the announcement. And with good reason, for these feudal sheikhs, be they Druze, Maronite, Moslem or Mettawalie, are an unmitigated curse. The trade of Batrone is chiefly in raw silk, oil and sponges, which are fished up in great numbers along this

coast. The women are celebrated for their skill in weaving the coarse *abeys* and other fabrics worn by the peasants—all honor to their useful industry. I fancied I could perceive the fruits of it in their well dressed husbands and brothers. We slept on the sandy beach of their miniature harbor, inside the town. The ancient harbor was on the south of the city, and was protected by a wall and pier. The present one is too small for boats of a large size, and is very unsafe. There are no antiquities of any note at Batrone.

Oct. 18*th.* Left Batrone at half past 3 o'clock, and following the wady et-Jous came in half an hour to the castle called Mesalaha. It is Saracenic, built on the top of an isolated rock whose small summit is entirely covered by it. This rock is perpendicular on all sides, and a stairway was hewn into it by which you ascend to the top. Standing in the plain midway between the rugged mountain walls of the valley at its narrowest part, the castle completely commands the road, and when garrisoned by robber bands of Mettawalies from upper Lebanon (as it often was in former days) no traveller could pass without paying whatever *aroniget* or *buksheesh* was demanded. It has been wholly deserted for many years, except by the adventurous goats that clamber up the well worn steps to repose beneath its cool vaults. From this castle the road leads over the mountain, at all times a romantic ride but doubly interesting in the bright morning moonlight. This spur of Lebanon projects far into the sea, and like Carmel, terminates in a lofty abrupt promontory, the Theoprosopon of the Greeks. It is now called Ras es-Shukah or Hâmât or Jeble Nûrîyeh, according as your informant is a sailor, a traveller or a pilgrim to the celebrated convent hanging on its northern declivity and dedicated to the Virgin as the Nûrîyeh or light-giver. The mountain is composed of chalky marl, very white and easily washed away, and the road winds up amidst curiously shaped cones, and along fearful precipices. In former times it was a famous haunt of robbers, and my Arab companion seemed to think the ghosts of those bloody deeds still lingered in those unfathomable ravines. At the foot of the *descent* is a very old graveyard, far from any inhabited village, and near it are traces of a ruined town. This may possibly be the Gigarta mentioned by Strabo as lying between Batrone and Tripoli.

From the foot of the mountain a wide plain stretches northward towards Tripoli. It is traversed by the following brooks on their way to the sea,—Asfoor, Shikka, Burgone, Jadge. The rock everywhere protrudes through the scanty soil of this plain, but little of which is under cultivation. This rock is highly fossiliferous, and so easily worn away, that the brooks have excavated deep channels through it,

so narrow that one may step from bank to bank, while the water dashes furiously at least ten feet below. This feature is quite unique, and in winter, renders the torrents troublesome and some of them even dangerous. Rising out of this plain, over a low marl hill we came upon some singular remains of ancient buildings, said to mark the site of a church called el-Kûtrûb. There was once a village in the vicinity. Further west towards the sea, are the remains of another church distinguished by the pompous name of Kneset el-Ouameed (church of columns); and quite on the extreme point of the low cape or headland which stretches into the sea, is the village called Enfeh (tip of the nose). There was once a considerable city on this point, and the ruins are supposed to mark the site of the Trieris of ancient geographers. A gentleman of Tripoli, every way worthy of credit, assured me that he examined the remains of twenty-six (!) churches at Enfeh, most of which were so well preserved that they might be fitted for worship at a very small expense; and there were many others quite ruined. I regretted extremely that we had not taken the lower road along the shore, which would have carried us through this interesting village. We could distinctly see the ruins, and could trace for several miles, the aqueduct that conveys water to the place even down to the present day.

After five hours' ride from Batrone we stopped to breakfast at Calmone, the Calumis of Strabo. It is now a small modern village, but having excellent water, it is surrounded by luxuriant orchards and gardens. From Calmone to Tripoli is a little more than one hour, and the approach to the city is through a large grove of olive trees, at the commencement of which is a small river called Bâhsâs, having a substantial stone bridge.

Modern Tripoli is built on both sides of the river Kadîsha where it issues from the mountains. This river rises amongst the Cedars of Lebanon above Bsherrai, and flows past Cânobîn, (the residence of the Maronite patriarch—the last prison, and the grave of Asaad Shidiak,) and finds its way to the plain through one of the wildest gorges in the world. Tripoli is a well built city of Saracenic origin, containing about 13,000 inhabitants, three-fourths of whom are Moslems, the remainder Christians of the Greek church. West of the city is a low flat delta, called Tripoli Point, extending into the sea two or three miles, at the extremity of which is Mînet Trabolus, or Landing of Tripoli, an unwalled town of about 4000 inhabitants. This is the site of the ancient city, which Strabo says was originally settled by colonies from Sidon, Tyre and Arvad. If they at first formed three settlements or villages, probably each had a Phenician name, and when the three

were united into one by the Greeks, they took a new name suggested by the union. Be this as it may, this place has no historic name but Tripoli, nor is there any Phenician name attached to any locality in this immediate vicinity. The existing ruins are of Grecian origin. Granite columns lie scattered along the shore, and are wrought into the old castles. There are also large masses of the ancient wall, particularly that which defended the east or land side of the city. It commenced at the sea near the modern town called et-Diwân, and ran south-west quite across the point of the Delta to the sea again, a distance of 600 paces. The other three sides being defended by the sea appear to have had less substantial walls, at least nearly all traces of them have disappeared. Only the *rubble* work of the eastern wall remains, the facing having been carried off for building-stone. Without the facing, it is eighteen feet thick, and appears to have been very high. Every foot of this enclosed Delta appears to have been covered with heavy buildings; and after the ruins have been dug over again and again for, no one knows, how many centuries, I found men still at work in this inexhaustible quarry. The ancient city was built on the Point, probably because it was much easier fortified—more healthy, as it still is—and nearer the shipping. The river passes through the present city, and so much water is distributed to the houses and gardens; and vegetation is so rank in consequence, that fevers prevail to a sad extent in autumn. Notwithstanding this serious evil Tripoli is regarded, by the natives, as, after Damascus, the most desirable residence in Syria. The houses are large and well built, and the gardens delightful, abounding in oranges, lemons, apricots, plums, pears, apples, peaches, and other oriental fruits. It is eminently a city of roses, and gives its name to one of the most beautiful varieties of this queen of flowers.

At the date of the first Crusade the city stood on the point. Raymond of Toulouse is said to have built the castle of the modern city in 1103, to protect the pilgrims from the Moslems of the city, in their passage down the coast. It was called the castle of the Pilgrims. Raymond died in this castle. The *city* was taken by Bertrand, assisted by the king of Jerusalem. Abu Tai, an Arabic historian, relates that a priest in the train of Bertrand, entering the large library of the city, and finding many copies of the Koran there, supposed that the whole collection consisted of this book, and therefore ordered them all to be burnt. Thus perished, says the author, 300,000 volumes! Novairi, another Arabic author, says there were 100,000 volumes in Arabic, Persian and Greek. This library was founded by the Cadi Alu Taleb Hasn, an author of much celebrity. Arab historians lament

the destruction of this magnificent library, while the Crusaders do not even mention it. In 1188 Saladin attempted to retake Tripoli but failed. But it was captured in 1289, by the sultan of Egypt, and the inhabitants massacred. In 1366, the king of Cyprus, assisted by the Knights of Rhodes, took and burnt Tripoli, and ravaged all the coast as far as Ladakî. In 1202 it was destroyed by an earthquake, which overthrew most of the cities in Syria,—a like calamity occurred in 1285. Such were the varied fortunes of this beautiful city during the middle ages.

Six square towers or castles command all the salient points around the bay. There were originally seven, but all traces of the seventh have long since disappeared. They are probably Saracenic, and about the age of the first crusade. Several of them have been nearly destroyed by Berber Aga, and his successor, Ibrahim Pasha. The Burj es-Sebaya is the largest, best built and best preserved. It is about ninety feet long, sixty-six wide, and has seventy granite columns wrought into the walls. The entrance affords a fair specimen of Saracenic architecture. Above the door was once a tablet with two lions carved upon it, and hence the name. This tablet was no doubt placed on the castle by some of the Counts of Tripoli. All the castles had embrasures for cannon built on the sea side. These appear to have been added after the invention of gunpowder rendered such appendages necessary.

A group of small islands extends into the sea about ten miles in a north-west direction from the Point. The most distant is called Ramkîn. The next is distinguished by an aged palm-tree, and called Nahly. It is said to have water on it, and was formerly used for rearing poultry and pork. They all appear to be destitute of soil and vegetation, and serve no valuable end but to protect the shipping in the harbor. I have the names of fifteen, and there are several more near the shore, but I shall not trouble myself or others by recording them. If any one is curious about names, he may consult Burckhardt, where most of them will be found. Did this Point once extend out to Ramkîn, and are these islands the only remnants which the waves have left? The rock of both, is the same loose sand conglomerate, and both the point and the islands rise but a few feet above the sea. If this is the origin of the islands they may wholly disappear in the course of future ages. On the other hand there are indications along the Syrian coast, that the shore has risen above its former level. And if such an elevation should again occur, the Point may be extended some ten miles further north-west. One more inquiry to the curious and the learned in such matters: Is the whole Delta, islands

and all, a deposit of the river Kadisha? This is the opinion of at least one who has examined the localities with much care.

In the district of Dûnnîyeh, east of Tripoli, near a village called Sufîry, are the remains of a Grecian temple. On one side there are three doors, the centre one at least twenty-five feet high and eight wide. A stairway led from one of the side doors to the top. A considerable part of the walls is still standing, but the columns are all prostrate. Some of the stones are twenty-two feet long. A friend of mine who recently visited these ruins, copied the following inscription from a stone which had lodged in the fork of a great tree that has grown up amongst the ruins.

ΑΥΡΙΗΡ⁰ΚΜΔΟΜΝΟΥΤΥΝΗΑΥϹΑ⁰Υ
ϹΙΤ⁰Υ\ΗΤΡΝ⁰ΥΗ⁰ΜΟΥΡ⁰ΗUΗΑΚΑΙΔ
ЄΤΙΠΡ⁰ΤЄΡΟΝ✕ΤЄΤΡΑΚΟϹΙω
ΝЄϬΑЄΡΤΑ↗ΗϹΚΥΡΙΑϹ.

This is probably the temple which M. Paujoulat calls Aurore, though my informant says it is called Kulaat el-Husn.

The building-stone of Tripoli is the same porous sand conglomerate as at Beirût, and the houses require to be plastered externally on the south and west sides, to prevent the rain from passing through the walls. As at Beirût also the rock on the shore is constantly worn away by the waves, and the sand thus formed is driven in upon the cultivated parts of the Delta by the prevailing south-west winds. But at Tripoli the water is abundant and vegetation luxuriant, and the encroachment of the sand will be much slower than at Beirût, and with care might be prevented altogether. Tripoli has long been stationary, nor is it likely to increase except in connection with some future general amelioration and advance of the country. The sudden and rapid growth of Beirût in our day is owing to causes which can never apply to Tripoli, and moreover when the commerce of the East shall be again restored to the head of this great sea, at the uncontrollable dictation of rail-roads, the fortunate *entrepot* will probably be at the mouth of the Orontes, or somewhere near the centre of Palestine, possibly at Acre. The heights of Lebanon cannot be scaled by the revolutionizing lines of trade and travel.

According to the register of taxation made by Ibrahim Pasha, there were in the city and Mîneh of Tripoli, 2167 taxable Moslems, 925 Christians of the Greek church, 83 Maronites, and 18 Jews; which multiplied by 5 gives an aggregate population of 15,965. Burckhardt estimated the inhabitants at 15,000 in 1812; and the city remains in most other respects precisely what it was when that most accurate traveller visited it.

Oct. 22nd. Left Tripoli at twenty minutes past 7 A. M. and at 8 o'clock we stopped to examine the Wely of Dervîshes, called Kubet el-Bedawy; were not able to ascertain whether this place derived its name from Bedâwy, the celebrated Arabic writer on jurisprudence, or from some great Moslem saint. The antiquated and dilapidated buildings of this famous convent of Dervîshes stand near a large fountain whose waters are collected in a pool in which are thousands of a peculiar kind of slate-colored fish, sacred to the saint, and fed by the Dervîshes. They may not be killed, not even by these holy anchorites, and legends without number and sufficiently marvellous, are current about them, all over the country. What other vocation, besides feeding these highly favored fish, is prosecuted by this fraternity of Moslem monks, does not appear. Both appeared to be full of fat and frolick, and altogether contented.

It is two hours and a quarter from Tripoli to Nahr Bârid, a considerable stream which comes down from the northern slope of Lebanon. The plain is well watered and fertile, but neither the brooks which wander through it, nor the villages which adorn the first slopes of the mountain, have any historic interest. A few minutes south of the bridge over the river, is a conspicuous mound with very ancient remains on the top. It is called Burj Hakmone el-Yehûdy. Who this Hakmone the Jew was, cannot now be ascertained, but the ruins are probably Phenician or Jewish, and form one amongst many indications that the Jewish kingdom extended in a remote age over this plain of Junia, and a part at least of the Ansairiyeh mountains. Near the mound are some sarcophagi of the most antique and primitive form; and on the north of the river above the khân are the remains of an extensive city. The large stones have all been removed, probably to build the city and castles of Tripoli. Rubbish, pottery, cisterns and wells cut in rock, are the works which remain of this once large town. The very name—all name—is lost in the darkness of remote antiquity.[1] The only building hereabouts is the old khân at the bridge bearing the name of the river, and also that of sultan Murâd the builder. Like most other public khâns in Syria it is gradually falling to decay. Arab geographers speak of three old castles in this neighborhood, none of which now appear, unless the curious square structure named B'hunneen, standing alone in the plain below the vil-

[1] May not these remains mark the site of the ancient Orthosia? The Peutinger Tables place that city at twelve Roman miles from Tripoli, and thirty from Antaradus, which corresponds very nearly to this position. The language of Strabo is indefinite. The Synecdemus of Hierocles enumerates it as north of Arca; but the authority of this writer is less than that of the Tables.—Eds.

lage called Mineh, be one of them. Perhaps there may have been a castle at Hakmone, and another at Kulâât, in the centre of the Junia.

In twenty-five minutes from Nahr Bârid we turned up from the sea shore eastward, to visit the ruins of Arca, the capital of the Arkites. The distance from the sea is about five miles; and in many places we noticed traces of the ancient Roman road. Along this same high way, some eighteen centuries ago, Titus led his victorious legions, after the destruction of Jerusalem, dragging after him crowds of Zion's most miserable captives; and in the magnificent temple of Venus Archites, upon whose broken columns we are about to gaze, did that victorious captain return thanks for his victories. The road crosses a beautiful plain rising gradually towards the eastern mountains. Midway between the sea and the city is a very ancient burying-ground, called B'ragief or Buragief, all solitary, with not a human habitation in sight, except a temporary encampment of Arabs. What mighty changes have passed over this plain!

Arca.

Everything here is interesting. The river (which ought to have a location on our maps between N. Bârid and N. 'Akkâr) comes tumbling down from the eastern hills, leaping over rocks, and bolting through dark chasms in a style altogether its own. The bridge spans one of the chasms, by a single arch not more than ten feet wide. This bridge is at the base of the high mound, which formed the Acropolis of Arka, upon whose summit stood the far-famed temple of Venus. This mound is about a mile in circuit at the bottom and rises a truncated cone to the height of about 200 feet above the bed of the river. The upper half of this cone is artificial, the base is solid rock. The temple stood on the south-east side, where the rock is perpendicular, and down this precipice the columns have been thrown. I counted sixty-four lying at the base of the rock, most of them broken. About one-third of these are of red Egyptian granite, the rest are gray. Amongst these columns I noticed a few large stones having the ancient (Phenician?) *bevel*—almost the only indication of an Arkitish origin. The city was built on the east, north, and west sides of the Acropolis. The ruins are extensive, and have many columns of granite and common limestone mingled with them. Most of the larger building-stone has been carried off, and the tradition of the place is that Arca has for many ages served as a quarry for Tripoli. This may be the origin of the *beveled* stone found in some of the castles at Tripoli. Another tradition states that there was an underground pas-

sage from the top of the Acropolis to the river near the foot of the bridge. We saw the door of this passage blocked up with a rude wall. It is in the mill at the bridge. High up in the face of the perpendicular rock over which the temple was built is a horizontal *tunnel* leading *under* the temple. A stream of water evidently flowed out of this tunnel, and probably came down through the centre of the mound from the temple. The canal which conducted the water to the temple from the mountains three hours (?) distant was *tunneled* through rocks, or carried over valleys on arches, as circumstances required. The mill-race at the bridge is carried under the surface, by a tunnel through the rock. It is probably ancient, and not originally made for a mill-race. Many of the people, and amongst them a venerable old priest, assured me that they had been up to the fountain which fed the canal, and that it was *tunneled* into the very heart of the mountain for half an hour! I could not visit this singular fountain, as it lay altogether out of our route.

A few rods above the bridge, on the south side of the river, is a high, perpendicular cliff of white calcareous sandstone, crowded with recent shells in as perfect preservation as when thrown up on the sea beach. I gathered many specimens of pectens cordium, Venus, etc. The *dip* of this formation is west, about 20°.

The present village has twenty-one families of the Greek church and seven families of Moslems—a wretched hamlet standing amid the columns of this once splendid city.

This city can claim a very high antiquity. It was the capital of the Arkites mentioned Gen. 10: 17 and 1 Chron. 1: 15. Josephus says that Arucæus the son of Canaan possessed Arca which is in Lebanon; Antt. 1. 6. 2. This is the amount of its history until the time of Alexander, in whose honor a splendid temple was erected, and dedicated as is supposed to Venus, the Artemis of the Phenicians. The worship of this goddess at Arca was probably far more ancient than the time of the Grecian conquest. The emperor Alexander Severus is said to have been born in this temple. Titus passed through Arca on his return from the destruction of Jerusalem. It is mentioned in all the itineraries of this region, and is conspicuous in early ecclesiastical records. It also figures largely in the exploits of the Crusaders. In 1099 it sustained a long siege from the first Crusaders. The vast plain below the city was covered by the tents of that most extraordinary army; and here occurred the famous dispute about the *sacred lance*. The question was no less grave than whether this lance was the one which pierced the side of the Saviour on the cross. The multitude was divided in opinion. Barthelemé (Bar-

tholomew) a crazy priest, was the champion of the sacred relic. Visions and revelations there were in abundance, but the unbelieving generation were not convinced. Barthelemé therefore resolved, or was persuaded, to submit to the ordeal or trial by fire. This quieted the camp. A large fire was kindled in the middle of the plain. Barthelemé advanced barefoot, holding the lance in his hand; and the chaplain of St. Giles pronounced in a loud voice these awful words: "If this man has seen Jesus Christ face to face; if the apostle Andrew has revealed to him the divine lance; may he pass safely through. If, on the contrary, he has been guilty of falsehood, may he be burnt with the lance which he holds in his hands." The whole multitude shouted amen! the will of the Lord be done! Barthelemé on his knees called heaven to bear witness to his truth and sincerity;—then rising walked deliberately through the fire unhurt!! But alas! the multitude rushed upon him to touch the victorious lance, trampled him under foot, tore off his clothes, and would have killed him outright, if Raymond with his guard had not rescued him. Poor Barthelemé died a few days after, either from his burns, or bruises, or both, and in his dying agony upbraided those who had persuaded him to dare the dreadful trial.[1] Notwithstanding this miracle, the holy warriors could not take the city; and after three months they broke up the siege, burnt their camp, and departed for Jerusalem. In 1109, however, Arca was captured by Bertrand, immediately after the fall of Tripoli. The expelled Moslems perhaps then retired into the mountains, and built the city of Akkâr, whose ruins we are next to examine.

A ride of two and a half hours into the wild mountains east of Arca brought us to Jibraîl where we spent the night. Although there are no villages on the plain, these mountains are crowded with them—a mixed population of Moslems, Mettawalies, Greeks and Maronites. The road led over chalkly marl hills, commanding a lovely prospect of mountain and vale and plain and sea. During the last hour we crossed numerous trap dykes traversing and tilting up the marl, and limestone strata, in every possible shape, angle and direction. In many localities trap dykes, shaped like huge wedges, have been driven up from unknown depths, bursting the strata and carrying them up in exact conformity to their own movements—thus showing both the disturbance, and the disturbing cause in most convincing and striking proximity. No better field for investigating certain geological questions need be desired. Most of the villages are built of black basalt, which gives them

[1] See also Wilken Gesch. die Kreuzz. I. p. 259 sq.

a gloomy aspect. The country is eminently fertile, and even in this dry season, both hills and valleys are clothed in green. Indian corn is the staple crop of Akkâr, and man as well as beast lives upon it.

Oct. 23*rd.* Left Jibraîl at sunrise. We are now passing over *new* ground. The people of this village never saw a Frank before, and were so curious and rude that we were obliged to use the *corbaj* to clear our tent last night before we could sleep. In half an hour from Jibraîl is the village Beit Millat—Maronite—in ten minutes more we came to el-Aiyune, where there is a mill, and near which is a large Greek village called Bainow. In seven minutes came to Cubbûla, embowered with trees, and with charming scenery all around. Burj el-Kuraiyeh is twelve minutes further, where is the palace of Muhammed Beg, the Mettawaly governor of this district. He is of the house of Miriab, an ancient and powerful feudal family. Aly Basha, famous over all these regions, for his wars, his works, and his wisdom, was an ancestor of the present Beg. We passed the palace without thought or ceremony, but a horseman was sent after us with a peremptory order to return and pay our respects to his Beg-ship. This was sufficiently provoking, but after disputing for sometime, we *accepted the invitation*, and in the end had no reason to regret it. We were received very politely by the Beg—a mere lad. There was a show of playing the *jenud* for our amusement, a breakfast was produced, and after endeavoring in vain to detain us for the day, he sent a horseman to guide and protect us to Akkar. Without this we should have lost our way twenty times, and very likely have been robbed. We had gathered but a very inadequate idea of the wild country, we were about to penetrate, and of the wilder people that inhabit it.

In fifteen minutes from Kuraiyeh we passed Aiyât, where are the remains of a temple of most antique style, called Mar Manos. The columns are square, rudely cut, and of an unknown age and order. Our guide (a respectable officer of the Beg) assured us that brazen calves have been frequently found amongst these ruins. In his young days he had repeatedly seen them, and from his description of them, they are exactly like those found in Lebanon, several specimens of which I myself have examined. This would prove, if proof were needed, that these brazen calves are not idols of the Druzes. From Aiyât we ascended a heavy trap mountain for half an hour, and from the summit called Dahar, and also Tel el-Kous we took the following bearings—Tripoli Point 84½, Palm Island 92, Ruad 145. A hill dimly seen to the north-east, which our guide said was at Hamath, bore 48. The prospect from this Tel is vast and magnificent, includ-

ing in its range the north of Lebanon, Tripoli and far south of it—the sea coast to Ruad and Tortora, with Cyprus in the horizon—the Ansaniyeh mountains, and the plains and hills towards Hamah and Hums. Akkâr, the object of our search, lies at the bottom of the gorge, directly east of us, at one hour's distance. The descent to it was through a beautiful wood of pine and other trees, and by a path not always safe. Our muleteer upbraided us for bringing him to a place from which he could never return with his mules alive, and we reminded him that he had deceived us, by positively declaring that he knew the place well, and could guide us to it; whereas he knew no more about it than his mule, and was frightened out of his wits at the mere sight of it. These ruins are called el-Medîneh, or 'the city,' by way of eminence. They cover the north-west slope of a steep hill—are piled up in endless confusion, and overgrown with briars, thorns, bushes and trees. The ruins are modern. I found the date 720 on an old mosque, which, however, appears to have been a church before it was transformed into a mosque, 542 years ago. The walls of many well built palaces and castles are still standing—the stones, however, are not large, and there are no columns. The palace called et-Tekîyeh presents the most imposing appearance. The entrance is lofty, and built of polished trap rock and limestone in alternate layers. Some of these palaces are covered with the richest mantle of ivy that I ever saw. Large walnut, oak, and other trees, with an impenetrable net-work of briars, bushes, and wild vines, conceal the ruins from distant observation, and the visitor is surprised and perplexed to find himself entangled, ere he is aware of it, in a maze of crooked, choked up streets, running, in all directions up and down this savage hill.

The castle stands on an isolated crag of rock, south of the city, from which it is separated by a tremendous ravine. The rock rises perpendicularly to a great height, and is defended by towers and a wall carried round the very edge of the precipice. It presents a formidable appearance, and to get to it, one appears to be entering the very bowels of the mountains, by this darkest and most sinister looking ravine. Taken altogether—the jagged Jurd Akkâr with its overhanging woods darkly frowning from above, the fearful gorge of the Nahr Akkâr, whose waters, the united contributions of a hundred rivulets, bound and bellow in hoarse vexation, through labyrinths of rocks and a wilderness of rank vegetation below, and the utter desolation and loneliness of the ruins, fit haunt for owls, satyrs and doleful creatures—yes, taken altogether, I have seen nothing to equal Akkâr in all my rambles through this strange world. But it is too wild, too

stern and savage, a very paradise of pirates and robbers, and by such it was perhaps first frequented.

Akkâr was for a long time governed by the Emeers of Beit Seîfa, a family now extinct. The tradition throughout Lebanon is, that they and this mountain city were destroyed by the celebrated Fakhr et-Deen. The fame of this Druze Chieftain had spread far and wide, but his personal appearance did not correspond, and the Emeer of Akkâr who had married Fakhr et-Deen's sister made himself merry at his expense. Fakhr et-Deen left Akkâr in a huff, swearing by everything sacred, that he would build his palace at Deir el-Kamar, with the best stones of Akkâr. This sinister threat he is said to have, in part at least, carried into execution when the city was destroyed. Some of the stones of the Tekîyeh of this place are believed to be in one of the palaces at Deir el-Kamar. Our guide however said that the Emeer of Akkâr having rebelled against the government, two armies were sent against him, one from Baalbeck, came over the mountain, the other came up from Tripoli. The place was taken by assault, the people butchered, and the city burnt. The Emeer Fakhr et-Deen may have been with one of those invading armies. Those of the people who escaped fled to Tripoli. I saw a Moslem merchant in Tripoli whose ancestors lived in Akkâr, and who still hold deeds of property which belonged to his family in this city several hundred years ago. At present the property has no owners. Whoever chooses to come and work the land may do so, paying only the taxes to Mohammed Beg of Kuraiyeh. The present village consists of about thirty miserable huts. The population is not stationary. There are now three Greek families, two Maronites and about twenty Moslems and Mettawalies. In a year to come there may not be an inhabitant, or there may be many more than at present.

The numerous rivulets which come tumbling down from the ragged Jeord and unite at the castle, form the river Akkâr, which works its way with difficulty to the plain in a north-western direction, and then meanders through it to the sea. By an energy altogether immeasurable the strata along this river have been twisted, dislocated and heaved up in maddest confusion; and the cause cannot be mistaken. Subterranean fires generated the gigantic power which drove these huge dykes of trap through the superincumbent limestone and threw the wrecks about in such wild disorder. The mountains hereabouts, and to the south, are called Jeord Akkâr. They rise in impracticable ruggedness to the snow-capped summits of Lebanon above the cedars, are clothed with forests, and abound in wild boars, hyenas, bears and panthers.

With face and hands sufficiently lacerated by the thorns, with clothes soiled and torn, and limbs wearied out with clambering over rocks and ruins, we left Akkâr and rode to Cûlaiât, a straggling village two hours distant, in a direction nearly north. Here are the ruins of several churches some of them having a traditionary history extending back to the primitive ages of Christianity. The people of this secluded spot, to our surprise, said they were all French, and as we were Ingleese and protestants, they would not sell us food either for man or beast. The mystery was now explained by the appearance of a Jesuit priest, who had recently settled amongst them. This gentleman however may not be at all accountable for the austere carriage of these poor peasants, as the Maronites are sufficiently surly and inhospitable to protestants without any foreign instruction.

Oct. 24*th.* Left our camp-ground at sunrise, and in forty-five minutes passed *old* Culaiyat, built of black basalt and mostly in ruins. The brook in the valley of Culaiyat flows into N. Akkâr. At the old village we ascended a high trap hill in a north-west direction, and the water on the north of this hill runs into the N. Kbeer. A rapid descent over trap rock and volcanic tuff brought us to Beri in twenty-five minutes. This village is the capital of the district called Draib, and the present governor is Abood Beg of the house of Miriab. The Beg informed me that the palace occupies the site of an ancient ruin which he supposed to have been a convent. In clearing away the rubbish they came upon a strong vault in which were found a variety of strange relicts, and amongst them brazen calves like those at Mar Manos near Aiyât. This information was given incidentally and not in answer to inquiries on our part, and seems to be worthy of credit. The worship of the calf appears to have prevailed throughout all these mountains.

The Beg gave us a horseman to guide and guard us across the country to Sâfetâ. To our surprise he led us for two hours and a half in a direction nearly west, although the great castle of Sâfetâ was in full view directly north. Our ride was a continual descent over trap bowlders which lay piled up in heaps as far as the eye could reach in every direction. Amongst these grow thick, short, gnarly oaks. This vast oak orchard is the most striking feature in the landscape, and extends from south-west to north-east twenty or thirty miles. At Amar Beg-kat a village of some note one and a half hours from Beri, I saw several basalt sarcophagi now used as watering troughs at the fountain. From this place we descended a steep hill of trap rock, and by two other similar descents, we reached the N. Kebeer at the bridge called Sheikh Aiyash, and also Jedeed. It was built by Aly

Basha of the Beit Miriab, who died seventeen years ago. It is an excellent affair of one large arch, and here passes the great road from Hamah to Tripoli. We were obliged to travel west all this distance to avoid the great trap chasms and perpendicular steps, which traverse the country from east to west, and across which no road can be carried. Through these dark chasms the rivers find or force their way to the plain. The N. Kebeer (the Eleutherus of the Greeks), forms the northern boundary of the Draib. The district south of it is called Junia and Jumeh and is governed by Mohammed Beg, and a third district further south is called Kaîteh and Kaitah, and is under the government of Mustafa Beg,—all of Beit Miriab. These three districts constitute the Akkâr, in which there are 141 villages, 1415 taxable Moslems (Mettawalies), 710 Ansairiyehs, 1775 Greeks, 910 Maronites. Total, 4810 which multiplied by five would make the population 24,050. The governors are all Mettawalies, the people are their serfs, and together they exhibit the most perfect example of old feudality to be seen in the country, with all its pomp and parade and poverty.

From Jisr Jedeed our direction was east of north across a fertile plain, and in half an hour we crossed a considerable stream called Mshahir at a village named Medhĕleh, where there is an encampment of stationary Arabs, and near it a large mound with the name of el-Jamûs or the Buffalo. Medhĕleh marks the west boundary of the district es-Shaarah, which extends east to the hills of Husn. In half an hour more crossed another branch of N. Kebeer, called Nahr Tel el-Khalîfeh, on the bank of which is the Ansairiyeh village Arzuneh. From this to N. Arûs is twenty-five minutes. The last branch of the N. Kebeer is the Sabbatic river of Josephus, which issues from the great intermitting fountain below the convent of St. George, called Nebâ el-Fuâr.[1] All these rivers are branches of the N. Kebeer, and they are all laid down incorrectly on the maps to which I have access. The main branch of N. Kebeer rises in the trap mountains a long way north-east of Kulaet Husn, flows through the elevated plain east and south-east of Husn for perhaps ten miles south of the castle, and then breaks down the great trap steppes, in a direction nearly west, which it continues across the plain to the sea.[2]

[1] An account of this fountain was given by Mr. Thomson in Silliman's Journal of Science, Nov. 1846.—Eds.

[2] In respect to the plain or country between Lebanon and the more northern mountains, Mr. Thomson remarks in a private letter as follows: "The water from the great fountains of the Orontes might be carried round the northern end of Lebanon into the Junia and to Tripoli."—Eds.

At N. Arûs the trap rock disappears and the road ascends a considerable hill of semi-crystalline limestone, passing Tel Tûrmûs, and then et-Tulaiyeh. At the latter village we found the governor of Sâfetâ with all his posse of ragamuffins, apparently making *caif.* Everywhere we are looked at with wonder, and often with suspicion. Franks have never been seen in these parts. From Tulaiyeh the water flows north and falls into the N. Abrosh which we crossed at a bridge of four arches—the name I failed to obtain. In Arrowsmith's map this river is placed *south* of N. Kebeer, which is a mistake. The distance between the two, by our road, is three hours' rapid riding—at least twelve miles. In twenty-five minutes from N. Abrosh is the first *harah* (division) of the village called Yesdîyeh—over the worst road I have met with out of Lebanon; twenty minutes more brought us to the second *harah* of Yesdîyeh, the inhabitants of which are Greeks and have a curious old church embowered amongs large oak trees. The third *harah* is fifteen minutes further, and here the sheikh of the whole resides. It being quite dark, and the road dangerous even by daylight, we pitched our tent in the yard of the sheikh—a surly, beastly looking Ansairiyeh, who gave us but a cold reception. From this to Burj Sâfetâ is one hour; to Tripoli, twelve hours; to Tortosa, six; and the same to Kulaet Husn.

Scattered over the fields to the north of Tulaiyeh, are bowlders of a yellow siliceous rock, which are crowded with very curious fossils. They bear a striking resemblance to *cows' tongues.* I obtained one about a foot long, which can be compared to nothing else. These bowlders are altogether foreign to the limestone rock of this region, and were probably transported from a distance. This however needs further examination.

[To be concluded.]

ARTICLE II.

THE STUDY OF GREEK AND ROMAN LITERATURE WITH REFERENCE TO THE PRESENT TIMES.

By Charles Siedhof, Ph. D., late Rector of the Gymnasium at Aurich, in the Kingdom of Hanover, now teacher of a private Classical School, Newton Centre, Ms.

After the long, almost lethargic slumber following the storms of the Reformation, and interrupted, if we except political disturbances,

whose appeal was rather to the sword than the pen, only by a few schools of theology that are still doing battle together, there finally dawned forth as a necessary counterpart a new day. All things which had been considered as authentic and sacred till the middle of the preceding century were now made a subject of doubt; they were shaken to their foundations, and the question was asked whether these were still strong enough to bear the structure that was daily growing higher and heavier. On this occasion novelty had its peculiar attractions; the German fondness for all things foreign afforded a wide field to English and especially French influences, and it seemed as if the Rationalism of Kant, which was striving to establish itself in all branches of learning and life, in place of the old harmless and implicit trust in authority, were destined to extirpate and destroy this blind confidence, root and branch. Then came the French revolution, breaking in upon the world and its mechanism with such appalling power, that its vibrations will not soon cease to agitate the minds of men. In its front stalks Napoleon like a wasting demon with iron sceptre. The steps to the imperial throne which, after the example of the Byzantine emperors, he strove to rear, are red with blood; he stands forth alone in the night of his time, like a baleful meteor, and points towards the East, with threatening finger, to down-trodden humanity that lay and groaned at his feet. But the sun arose victorious here; the meteor vanished suddenly, as it had come; in its place a joyous dawn shone forth, only obscured by occasional driving clouds.

Amid such stupendous revolutions,—unexampled in extent and suddenness,—and their consequent changes, it is natural that individual elements should not at once come distinctly forth and act and react till they neutralized each other; they differ rather by almost imperceptible shades, and harmonize or conflict with one another in proportion to the greatness of their sympathies and antipathies. It is not the object of these remarks to show how this takes place in all the various relations of society; we shall content ourselves with showing the view in which Greek and Roman literature is regarded at the present day, as distinguished from former times. On the one side are the philologists of the old school, holding up the study of this literature in highways and byways, as the one thing needful for almost every man; on the other it is every day attacked with increasing zeal and violence; and decried not as merely useless, but as a positive incumbrance and hindrance to the problems the present age has to solve. Between the two extremes lie an infinite multitude of views; covenants and compromises are made upon concessions from which only a temporary truce can be extorted; the fire still glows

under the ashes, and soon bursts forth again at an unexpected moment, and the more the material that has gathered, the fiercer are the flames.

To estimate aright these conflicting opinions it is indispensably necessary to take a view of the past; for the past always forms the basis of the present. But since such a phenomenon as we are now considering is without a parallel in the history of the world; the language and literature of extinct nations maintaining such a high significance, and exercising such an important influence on life and culture as those of the Greeks and Romans have exerted on the whole western world; such a retrospect becomes doubly necessary if we would avoid the easy path of error, and do something more than blindly follow the loud brawlers on both sides, who launch forth assertions instead of proofs.

Rome had conquered the world; nothing remained then for her but to wrap herself in her shroud, for her dissolution was at hand. She had striven not to conciliate but to annihilate all national characteristics differing from her own, and though this daring attempt had failed in a few instances, as among the German nations, it had in the main succeeded. As soon as this vocation was fulfilled, she folded her hands and saw her domain divided into the Eastern and Western empires, and barbarians pour in to destroy all of her but her name.

The immediate consequence of her unbounded supremacy, was the successful attempt to thrust upon the conquered nations her language; a language whose perfection made it possible either wholly to suppress the national languages of the various provinces, or at least to throw them far in the back-ground. Had Herrman, the Cheruscan, not appeared on the stage, we should assuredly not have had the glorious German tongue, which still maintained its ground when the Latin had usurped sway, as the medium of communication among the learned.

We will direct our attention particularly to the middle ages. Christianity had chosen in the West the Latin language as its organ; yet the multitude of entirely new ideas it called forth, caused the language, already much corrupted under the emperors, to assume a garb altogether new, and in the course of time it bore hardly any resemblance to the old tongue. The efforts of the theologians to secure for Christianity the treasures of the Aristotelian philosophy which had been laid open by the Arabs, tended to the same end. The language thus built up on the foundations of the Latin, retains a general family resemblance to it only in a few external features. We cannot measure them both by the same rule, without doing to one or the other of them

the greatest injustice. *Quidditas*, *haeccitas*, *aseitas*, and similar words are indeed *monstra* compared with Cicero's style; in reality, however, they are not so, any more than *possibile* and *possibilitas* which too were unknown to Cicero; they are rather the creations of a new mind; but we must not imagine them to be Latin.

During the whole of the middle ages Greek was unknown, and when it was introduced into Germany by Reuchlin, (who went to Paris expressly to learn it,) and by his successors, the monks preached against it, declaring that the Devil, ever seeking the injury of man, had invented a new language, the Greek.

Under these circumstances ancient literature was passing into oblivion, and would have been lost, we may suppose, had not the eternal law of God's providence called forth a reäction. In Italy the restoration of learning began; the Latin language was studied with ever increasing enthusiasm; Italian literati, like Petrarch, went on distant and dangerous journeys to collect or copy manuscripts of the ancients. The Greeks—still polished and learned, like their ancestors,—who had been driven from Constantinople by their rude victors, found a welcome reception as teachers in schools and universities. Finally the art of printing was invented. The words on the leaf that the statue of Guttenburg in Strassburg holds spread out in its hand, are strikingly true: *Et la lumière fut;* a noble inscription with which the defective Latin verses on the statue in Mainz are not to be compared.

Shortly before, the enthusiasm for Latin had passed to a singular extreme. Not only did the Ciceronians persuade themselves that everything, new and old, could and should be expressed in Cicero's terms,—Christ, to cite an instance, they called *Jupiter Optimus Maximus*,—but with the language they also exchanged the idea, and Christianity existed with the learned only in name; Pope Leo the Tenth is said to have spoken of the "*fabulæ de Christo*," which brought much money into the church.

This new world, created with such mighty influences, was completed by the Reformation. But though its great author, Luther, elevated the German tongue by his translation of the Bible, to a degree that we should consider impossible, if we examined the language immediately before his day; yet he was obliged like his fellow-laborers in the stupendous work, to retain the Latin as a means of communication with the learned, both in writing and speech; for the scholars at the newly established universities spoke and wrote nothing but Latin, so that established tradition had its hallowed influence upon the great man: Latin had become the prevailing language in all church business; and Luther had, besides, much to do with the Italians.

Still the language of Luther and the Reformers was far purer than that of the schoolmen of the middle ages, or rather the two admit of no comparison. Even Reuchlin's style is very harsh; his pupil Melanchthon wrote best of all. We can see that the great moral revolution brought about by the Reformation was not without its effects even in this respect.

What is true of the prose of this age is true likewise of its poetry. Who has not heard of Petrus Lotichius Secundus, and his exquisite Latin elegies, so much admired by all true lovers of poetry? It was perhaps no loss to the fame of the young poet that he died at Heidelberg in the bloom of youth, in consequence of poison unintentionally administered to him in Italy. Burmann, the younger, edited these charming poems in two quarto volumes accompanied by learned annotations, in the style of an ancient classic; he calls Lotichius the phœnix of poets, which he really is.

But this period of advancement did not last long. The necessity of establishing the new science of theology, and the variety of philosophical systems occasioned a rapid corruption of style, in the same way that the German was corrupted by an intermixture of French. New ideas make new forms necessary, and in the philosophical writings of Leibnitz and Wolf we see almost a return to the scholastic Latinity. Notwithstanding all this, the shackles the Latin imposed were even at that time cumbersome to some, and they chose the French; Leibnitz, to name a familiar instance, wrote his *Theodicee* in that language.

On the whole, however, it was still considered absolutely necessary to learn the Latin for practical purposes; in the schools hardly anything but Latin was taught; it was made the duty of all rectors and teachers to train their pupils to speak it, and to adhere steadfastly to it as the language of conversation. But to prevent the former barbarisms from creeping in, collections of the more common ones were made of which we mention here only those of Goclenius, of the Dane Borrichius and Cellarius. Laurentius Valla, the Italian, in his Elegantiae and Dukerus de Latinitate Ictorum had a different end in view.

The case was everywhere the same as in Germany; only in Italy and France the national languages, being earlier developed and perfected, sooner maintained their proper rights. Du Thou (Thuanus) retained the Latin in his great historical work. In Holland especially did the study of the language flourish, and here a far purer style was maintained than in most other countries. When we consider the long series of renowned classical scholars who labored so zealously within

so small a sphere for centuries, we are struck with a kind of holy awe. Particularly was Leyden distinguished for possessing such scholars as Scaliger, Heinsius, Hemsterhuis and others. The great similarity in the labors of all the Dutch philologists is very striking, and only a few in these times, like Hemsterhuis and Heinsius form an exception. This similarity is the more remarkable from most of the Dutch philologists being foreigners, chiefly Germans. They were distinguished by an untiring diligence in the collection of materials; they gathered these from all quarters, and piled them up in great masses, which cannot fail to excite wonder. Oudendorp worked on Apuleius thirty years. Their labors, however, are utterly void of taste and that sort of criticism which advances the study. It either relates to the various readings, in which case only the number of manuscripts is regarded, without much attention to their relative value, or it is conjectural, and characterized by an extraordinary degree of boldness.

It is not at all strange that through the influence of so many great men all Holland became in great measure latinized. A good and elegant Latin style, as well as facility in speaking, was demanded of every educated man.

It only remains for us to cast a glance at England. With what pleasure Erasmus had previously visited his friend, Sir Thomas More, is well known. It is equally well known that the severe discipline of the English schools favored immediately, and still continues to favor, classical study. Yet these studies have not been pursued with an immediately practical view since the time of Cromwell. England early had a public political life, and had assigned both to Greek and Latin their appropriate sphere, before the nations of the continent began to inquire what rank should be assigned to these studies.

The zenith of English learning was reached by Richard Bentley, a man whose name will be mentioned with astonishment and admiration as long as philological studies are cultivated. Such learning and such keen penetration will not soon be found united in one man. Though we should not consider his declaration in the preface to Horace, "that he had taken up these studies for a half-years' recreation after severe labors," as strictly true; (which, however, were it strictly true, would set his gigantic powers in a stronger light;) yet this very book remains an imperishable monument, from which one can learn what constitutes true criticism.

Hemsterhuis, the Hollander above mentioned, was a younger contemporary of Bentley. With him commences the transition from the earlier to the later times. His boundless learning was combined with the greatest keenness; but at the same time he considered it as highly

important to act the part of the man of the world, in which he differed from the rest of the Dutch philologists. With him begins the true philosophical study of the Greek.

From the time of Thomasius the professors at the German universities had been gradually venturing to lecture in the German language. These experiments rapidly spread, since even in the middle of the preceding century almost all the lectures in the then learned professions, were read in German, in the Protestant universities at least, with the exception of that at Leipsic. John Augustus Ernesti laughed indeed at the *Frau Muttersprache* (Mrs. mother-tongue) as he called the German; yet he contributed not a little himself by his learned and elegant expositions of the classics, first at the Thomas school at Leipsic, where he was originally rector, and afterwards as professor at the university, to the just estimation of his native tongue, and freed it from the disgrace and abuse with which the schools had loaded it. Side by side with Ernesti in Leipsic stood John Matthias Gesner; his departure to the university of Göttingen, founded by the great baron of Münchhausen was particularly advantageous for the northwestern part of Germany. Both these men have done so much by their teachings and example for the proper cultivation of classical studies, that their services can never be too highly prized; multitudes of their scholars, sought out as teachers in all parts of Germany, diffused the new and improved ideas to which these great scholars had given birth.

In Holland likewise a path had been broken by the great Hemsterhuis, so that Ruhnken, who had left Wittenberg to study Greek at Leyden instead of at Göttingen, under Gesner's instruction, as he originally intended, with the aid of his fine taste, his polished and courteous manners, and his exemplary Latinity, could at once labor with effect. By degrees he forgot his German, and as he had learned a little bad Dutch and French, (the latter of which he pronounced as it was written,) merely for the daily purposes of life, he wrote in the Latin language alone, and with such accuracy and care that Gesner's Thesaurus was always to be found on his table. Neither he nor Ernesti spoke it at all. How essential he considered this language as an organ of communication among the learned is well illustrated by an anecdote related by his biographer and successor, Wyttenbach. A German professor imprudently remarked before Ruhnken, in the library at Leyden, that the foolish custom of writing learned books in Latin had long been given up in Germany. Ruhnken instantly closed the book-case, and said passionately, "Be off with your stupidity; go and find other libraries where you can meet with German books."

This speech sounds harsher indeed in the translation than in the Latin original.

Ruhnken's pupil and follower, Wyttenbach, like him wrote only Latin, and in a letter to Matthiae, who had sent him his Greek Grammar, lamented that this work was not written in Latin. Wyttenbach's style is very fine, although the *grata negligentia* is altogether too predominant. His pupils, so far as I can judge, imitated him in this respect with great zeal.

All these men recommended the study of the classics, in conformity with the hereditary opinion of the excellence of the ancient writers as to form; they wrote Latin for similar reasons, because there was need of a language common to the learned of all countries. They were all so firmly attached to their convictions that nothing could move them.

As these studies had been hallowed for centuries, so that parents almost unconsciously and mechanically wished for their children a classical education, above all things, as containing in itself all the promises. In the latter part of the eighteenth century, Basedow, a man of rare genius, but of an extremely violent and impetuous character, met with the strongest opposition in advancing his new views. He maintained that languages were only "*a means to an end*," and therefore when compared with the ideas, so subordinate, that we ought not to trouble our heads about them, but slide over them as rapidly as possible. "In general," says he, "only what is of use for the purposes of life has any value; that alone then must be taught and learned."

The Philanthropinum was founded in Dessau; its name alone contained a severe criticism on the classical schools which now united and fought against it. In the Philanthropinum (which Basedow however did not long conduct), everything was taught in the way of amusement. In the study of the languages the grammar was banished and oral instruction took its place. We have been assured by eye witnesses, that the young pupils of the Philanthropinum spoke Latin with uncommon fluency. But what sort of Latin was it? Since few professional philologists are sufficiently versed in the language to pronounce what is good Latin, we place no reliance on the judgment of men who long ago dropped their Latin and applied themselves to studies totally different. We would believe Ruhnken or Ernesti, but not even these implicitly.

The Philanthropinists, so called, Campe and Salzmann, had great influence upon the public in spite of the outcries of the philologists, and soon began to win its confidence. They composed a great num-

ber of books, many of which were excellent for the instruction and discipline of youth, and had the art of making them highly captivating in substance and form. We need only mention Campe's Robinson and Discovery of America, which are even at the present day the pleasantest and most profitable reading for children. At the same time they published popular works on education itself and its means and ends, and had great influence on the minds of parents by making Love and Gentleness the most prominent objects. Time had undermined and shaken the rigor of former days in many ways; the Philanthropinists found therefore in many quarters a welcome reception. At last they founded other special institutions of their own, and so confirmed their theories by experience that but few pupils of the Salzmann Institute at Schrepfenthal (to select one instance out of many) could be found, who would not think of it with devoted affection.

The origin of all these movements, both on the part of the old school philologists, and on that of the Philanthropinists, was a correct yet vague consciousness, that has remained to the present hour, together with the party contests, which in spite of the change of names and the demands of the age, are still one and the same.

Meanwhile Heyne made his appearance at Göttingen and Wolf at Halle, and subsequently Hermann at Leipsic, three men, who have effected so much by their teachings and example that they will always be had in reverence. Heyne, self-taught rather than the pupil of Ernesti, showed how to expound the ancient poets with taste, opened new points of view in his archaeological lectures, and filled schools far and near with teachers who had sat at his feet. Wolf, likewise more of a self-made man than Heyne's scholar (who was highly commended by him—honestly too,—and not out of envy and fear in order to remove him from Göttingen as Körte, Wolf's biographer, thinks), not only defined the boundaries of classical studies with clearness and arranged the elements around one common centre, but also left works of such excellence, though still incomplete, that his influence in the whole province of philology has become colossal. His lectures, moreover, had a magic power over his hearers, through their scintillations of striking and oftentimes cutting wit, and he had the art of setting his audience on fire to a wonderful degree. Time with its rapid movement has long since begun to cover and mitigate the faults which his contemporaries could have wished removed, and to present him in his true character. And now Hermann, that venerable and every way knightly veteran, the father of metrical science, still continues to defend with his example and his mighty word, a field on which he

rules triumphant. Boeckh, Thiersch and many others are fellow-laborers at the same great work. In this way the spirit of the times could be restrained within its proper bounds. The gymnasia could not close themselves to these demands, but gradually embraced more and more of the practical studies, the arts and sciences, many perhaps to too great a degree. But they endeavored by an improved method of teaching, to regain the time lost in this way. Greek, particularly, acquired an importance not before known nor anticipated. After Dissen had shown the possibility of reading the Odyssey with boys, the Jackmann Institute was founded. Passow was appointed a director. In this school the classical course began with Greek, and it seemed probable that this might take the place of Latin.

At this time the well-known Examination-Law was passed in Prussia. How completely conformable this was to the age, how well it expressed the views of the time, can be seen from the zeal with which it was commended and gradually adopted, with some trifling alterations indeed, in almost all the States of Protestant Germany. It has, without doubt, effected much good, compared with which its disadvantages vanish. Its displacement by a new one, only shows the enlightened judgment of the Prussian government; it was relinquished because it had fulfilled its purpose. Life is constantly generating new forms, which no legislator may hope to repress; he can only conduct their development.

Previous to this, when Klopstock had shown by his admirable Messiah how to imitate in German the ancient measures, and particularly the hexameter, Voss had begun to translate the classical poets in the original metres; he has thus diffused among the mass of the people a knowledge of the ancient poets without a parallel in any other country, to say nothing of his influence on the German tongue in enriching and perfecting it. The glorious old champion may well endure the contempt with which many would visit him, even in his grave. He is still, as Heindorf says, one of the first and best men of Germany.

Meanwhile the liberation war against Buonaparte began. All Europe was strongly impressed with the great idea of freedom. Classical studies therefore could occupy but a subordinate position till the establishment of peace, and struggled for existence at schools and universities, and even from these both teachers and pupils sometimes marched to the field.

The great authors, who had raised the German language to an almost incredible perfection, had with the exception of Göthe, all passed off the stage. The power of the vernacular language as shown for the first time in their productions, reached its highest glory in the very

midst of the ever-memorable war, so that through them the Germans came to a consciousness of its treasures. When the perils of war were by the united energies of the people driven back, and peace was established, many looked mistrustfully upon classical literature, and thought to banish it the easier, because meanwhile the old monuments of national literature had been studied with a spirit of rivalry; before this hardly the names of these works had been known.

But the philologists too were putting forth all their strength. All branches of the study of antiquity were treated with profound learning and copiousness (generally however in German, so that, contrary to the old prevailing custom, but few compendiums were written in Latin, except those pertaining to philological subjects), and valuable manuals were published in countless numbers. But it became more and more obvious to every thinking mind, that a new age had dawned with new thoughts and ideas, and as most of the philologists continued to recommend Latin with a view to practical use in writing and speaking, they were forced to be content with a Latin syntactical form, declaring that single words were of no consequence whatever, and that in this they had the authority of Cicero and other great classical writers, who had borrowed terms from the Greek. The fundamental error of this mischievous and detrimental idea is so apparent, that we wonder how it could be long adopted and followed. We shall recur to this topic again, and would only observe in this connection, that the dangerous advice which is a consequence of it is nothing but a necessary concession proceeding from a false view of the Latin, and the ends for which it is to be studied. This rule not only violates the repeated declarations and instructions of the ancients themselves; for instance, Caesar says in his lost book *De Analogia:* Tamquam scopulum, sic fugias insolens verbum; but also the peculiar sanctity of nationality and language, on which an individual, especially a foreigner, has no right to intrude. Cicero indeed as a Roman had the right of drawing from other sources, when the springs of his own land failed, as the German or Frenchman who is master of his own tongue has the same right. But what should we say if a German or a Frenchman should undertake to enrich our language with new words? Yet this would not be so bad as the case in hand; for he would be contributing to a language that was still living, and that represented the culture of his age. Can we thus confer on a dead man properties and qualities he never possessed in his life-time? But apart from all this, it must be evident to all that foreign interpolators only disfigure a language, as patches of many colors do a coat of one color. A sober, honest man would never show himself on 'change in such a garment. No-

body admires the German which was written at a time when it was customary to interlard it with French. Nobody admires the German of the philosophical schools in which they are obliged to intermingle words drawn from foreign languages ancient and modern with the German words, to express their new ideas.

The writing of Greek, which has been almost entirely abandoned, especially after the decision of Ernesti in the preface to Hedericus's Lexicon, was likewise resumed and carried so far that in some gymnasia original compositions were required of the pupils. It is probable, however, that this extended practical course, so impossible and unsuitable, is now narrowed down to the proper bounds, which limit it to grammatical exercises.

We must here mention another important service in which Friedemann has been mainly instrumental by his *Guide to the Composition of Latin Verse*. The revival of a means of culture so useful in every point of view, which most of the German schools had abandoned, must appear to every instructor who is not behind the age, a thing most desirable. This work has made many older teachers Friedemann's grateful pupils.

The long repose which followed the wars, the growing necessities of an increasing population, and the progress of luxury among all orders, naturally turned the public mind aside from ideal and literary to material and practical pursuits. The natural sciences acquired an immense importance from the astonishing discoveries that were made. Manufacturers, artists, even common mechanics could no longer live without them; or they were soon outstripped by those who had studied the sciences when entering upon their occupation.

This pressing necessity finally called the schools for the practical arts and Polytechnic schools into being. We might reasonably expect the philologists to rejoice over the establishment of these schools; for they relieved their own institutions of much burdensome labor, which distracted their efforts without producing any good, and which was worse than useless. They gave them an opportunity of simplifying their course of instruction, which time had made unmanageable by vast additions, and rescuing from the sweeping torrent of the *Realia*, and establishing as a prominent object the fundamental studies of the gymnasia,—the classical languages, German, mathematics and religion. But the result proved otherwise. Like men of hypochondriacal history, which revels in the past, sighs over the present and has no future, they violently attacked the new institutions and the motives which led to their foundation. What strange and absurd dogmas were advanced on this occasion, even by learned and thoughtful men! All manifested a

kind of reckless contempt for the practical tendencies of the age; most considered the natural sciences as unsuited for the mental development, and went so far as to say that such studies were highly dangerous in a moral point of view, because the teacher of natural history, for instance, was compelled to unfold the secret of procreation, which nature had veiled. The absurdity of this is too evident to need comment. And how is it in many cities and those not always large cities, where the most anxious care on the part of fond parents cannot preserve their children from impressions which poison their souls? How is it with the domestics of individual families,—nay, how is it with school-boys and school-girls themselves? Indeed we can but smile at the evils apprehended from the study of natural science; for instead of confirming these evils, it lessens and prevents them.

Many said moreover that the discipline in those schools for the practical arts is bad; but this is the fault of the teachers, not of the things taught. Others, finally, refer us to the testimony of merchants and manufacturers in favor of pupils of the gymnasia, and infer from their superiority, the superiority of those establishments. These and many similar arguments have been so often repeated and so frequently varied and ruminated, that we cannot but be surprised at the vague ideas they presuppose, and perplexed what to say to them.

The censure to which the philologists are liable for their attacks on the advocates of practical study, are applicable in a higher degree to their opponents themselves; for not contented with the new domain allotted them, they tried with all their might to crush the study of classical literature, with its teachers and its guardians, the gymnasia. If they had their way,—which happily they do not have, and never will have,—the whole world would be turned into one great workshop, and every man would be forced to surrender himself to material things, and destitute of all ideas and aims toward anything higher, to wend his way through this life in sadness and gloom. Since, from the nature of the case, the arguments against the study of the classics have been more widely diffused than those have been which are urged in its favor by the philologists, and since many of these attacks are supported by indisputable truths; for the philologists with an incredible obstinacy continue to defend their position with arms forged by a past age, and altogether unfit for the present, which calls for newer and better weapons; we will here first enumerate the arguments brought against classical literature, and endeavor either to establish or refute them, according as they may merit.

Those who oppose ancient literature on the ground that they cannot learn from Homer and Virgil how to bake bread and to salt meat,

nor from Cicero how to dye a blue without indigo, we may reasonably set aside. They are perhaps modest enough, even in this immodest age, not to expect an answer; should they wish one, they must look elsewhere for it.

Many however say that only the matter of the ancient writers is of importance; and this, be it what it may, can be learned from a translation as well as from the original. Yet even this, they maintain, is often positively objectionable. If we examine the poets, for instance, and even the chastest and most delicate poets, our moral feeling is rudely shocked by their erotic nudities. It is dangerous then to put Horace into the hands of the young. Setting aside the odes and epodes, the satires especially, must make us hesitate. The finest of them, for example, the Journey to Brundisium and the Instructions of Tiresias, where Ulysses is advised to turn legacy-hunter, for the purpose of restoring his shattered fortunes, are not free from contaminating spots which may ruin youthful minds. Even Virgil, in general so pure, depicts in his Georgics, and in his Aeneid touches upon things which should be kept far from the young. The rest of the Roman poets, individually and collectively, are far more objectionable. The prose writers are no better. Though few of them are immoral in the above-mentioned sense—yet there are more even of these stains than is well—still they contain immoral ideas, they praise or defend suicide or other violent deaths and must necessarily be injurious to moral culture. What is true of the Romans is true in part at least of the Greeks. The fathers, before reading Aristophanes, always prayed to God that he would keep them free from the vice and crime which this poet openly represents. There is hardly one poet of this nation that we can call absolutely pure, and we cannot wonder therefore that even the divine Plato establishes a republic at which a Christian must shudder. Yet Plato is a great philosopher, and a famous writer. But admitting the fancied excellence of the Greek and Roman writers, (they continue,) it can all be seen through the medium of translations, as well as from the originals; and we must yield assent to the assertion of philosophers, that all the good, true and beautiful in the classics has long been the common property of the civilized world; we find it expressed better than the ancients themselves expressed it, not only in our classics but in Ladies Magazines and Almanacs.

Furthermore, it cannot be proved that the study of languages and classical literature is a necessary part of education. The ancients themselves acquired their greatness without the study of foreign languages; it should be occasional then, and as a means for special ends. But if some of the Romans studied Greek, it only shows the literary pov-

erty of this heroic people. Cicero's writings in imitation of the Greeks are his faultiest, and the odes of Horace are for the same reason the worst of his poems. In the second place, the number of the modern classics trained after the philological fashion of the day is unquestionably small, compared with those who were not. To confine ourselves to the German, it is notorious that Schiller did not know Greek at all, and Göthe hardly enough to read a Greek poet tolerably. Even Wieland, say they, according to Böttiger and others made his translations from old French versions. With the rest of our translators, and those of other nations, the case is the same.

Conversely, great philologists by profession are often but insignificant writers. In the various duties of life they play but an awkward part;—instead of the humanity from which they proudly borrow a title, we find in them a certain inhumanity, so to speak, and philological coarseness is become proverbial;—and they do not know how to value other liberal pursuits, notwithstanding their Cicero says that a common bond embraces them all. Of how few philologists can it be said that they were great statesmen or warriors! Neither Frederic the Great nor Napoleon nor old Blücher knew anything of philology. Hannibal conquered the Romans before he could decline *musa*, and Franklin never learned *τύπτω*, nor was matriculated at Göttingen or Jena.

But if it be true, (they proceed,) in spite of these remarkable facts, that ancient literature has the supreme excellence which the philologists ascribe to it, how does it happen that with the exception of a few philologists, who derive their knowledge for the most part from what they learn at lectures in the public institutions, hardly any one is to be found, who carries his classical studies beyond the academic course? Ask the greater portion of our divines, lawyers and physicians whether they ever take up a single Latin or Greek author in their leisure moments, to refresh themselves with the incomparable and divine pattern of all that is beautiful and glorious. They will tell you they have often lamented that they have no time for such reading. This timid confession is but a relic of respect for ancient customs and traditions. The case was different, it must be admitted, a hundred years ago, when we had no national literature, and when our language was rough and unpolished; and with the Italians and French of an earlier period, before their own literature had supplanted that of the ancients.

Languages are means to attain certain ends. If their study then were indispensable, which we deny, we might apply ourselves to the English, the German, the French, the Italian and the Spanish. Here

too great treasures are to be found; and we acquire something withal that can be profitably applied to the purposes of life. The English language has been enfeebled by being too much Romanized; its true strength lies in its Saxon element. If, therefore, the German, which rivals the Greek in power of combination, should be studied as the Latin and Greek have hitherto been, its influence on the culture and development of the English would be worth more than that of Greece and Rome.

The value attached to the writing and speaking of Greek and Latin, they say in conclusion, is preëminently ridiculous. The philologists are grown wise enough, to be sure, to give up writing Greek. Latin, however, every body who makes any claim to continental scholarship, must be able to speak and write. Now since not one of ten thousand educated men can utter a couple of Latin sentences with tolerable correctness, (and here we are not speaking of actual conversation, as we understand conversation in French or conversation in Italian,) and since the proportion is less in France or England than in Germany, then those who are excluded by a little knot of stiff pedants from all claims to literary acquirements, can hardly do more than laugh at such presumption; and they would be doing no injustice in casting back the censure upon their inconsiderate judges.

The philologists strive, by repeatedly asserting the need of a universal language, to make the assertion take the place of a proof. But how is it that even among philologists themselves none continue to write Latin, if we except the commentaries of the ancients—and even the best of these are now written in the vernacular tongue—and in some instances the official school and university programmes? Not even their organs, the philological journals are now written in Latin, and even in Holland, that land so true in its attachment to the philology of a past age, the Bibliotheca Critica Nova was suspended for want of support. And yet what more fitting place to practise this essential art than these journals afford?

How does it happen, moreover, that the rise of all the sciences dates, almost without exception, from the time instruction was first given at the universities and schools in the vernacular tongue? How does it happen that philological learning itself began to advance when Latin was abandoned in school-books and lectures? The answer is obvious; in writing Latin we are stuck in a strait waistcoat which only allows no *verba facere*, instead of bringing ideas to light; the ideas perish at their birth, because we leave them to themselves and only seek a worn out garb for them. Where the raiment is the all-essential thing, not the wearer, it is impossible in spite of all the decoration, to appear to advantage.

The ancients themselves had no language of the learned. The one so long borrowed from them is become so useless that we should like to return it to the owners, and see them take it back. But we should be obliged to return it as quietly as possible and in the dark; by daylight they would not recognize their language, as it has been written by most moderns.

The great stress that has been laid since Wolf's time on the discipline of the intellect, which the study of the classics, and writing and speaking the languages are said to afford, the perpetual hue and cry about mental discipline, shows plainly how distressed the poor philologists are. And it is really lamentable that they should think to lay hold on this anchor of need, and to cling to it at the last, now that the others are torn away and lost. Again and again has the emptiness of their final hope been shown them; still they stand by it, cast a mournful glance at the shifting sands on which it rests, and strike up *unisono* the old song. All is of no avail. We may point to the numerous scholars who became such without the assistance of classical schools. We may demonstrate to a certainty that like means of culture are to be found in mathematics, in the natural sciences, in English and modern literature. We see that the deaf, who *will* not hear, are the worst persons in the world to deal with; and that nothing is left but the charitable hope that Time, the great adjuster, may effect in them what example and precept never have done nor can do.

We can see without difficulty, as was remarked above, the justice of all or the most of these attacks on classical studies, and the impossibility of warding them off one by one, without regard to the sum total of modern life in all its parts and ramifications. The arms commonly taken up against them are become mouldy and rusty. Time greedily devours his grown up children, to gather strength for the birth of new ones. But the philologists need not tremble for a moment, nor fear for the stability of their sway. The instant that destroyed it would give a mortal stab to all true culture; the world would inevitably sink back into that night of barbarism from which it has come forth with such stern labor and at such bitter cost.

The whole dispute between the philologists and the advocates of practical studies springs from an indistinct idea of education itself; that is of its nature, its ends and its means. The contest is therefore about elementary principles, and without a mastery of these principles, nothing can come but obstinate tenacity in asserting them. No end

to the quarrel could else be hoped for but by the exhaustion of both parties,—an end lamentable and unworthy this age of undeniable improvement, and the importance of the subject of dispute.

It will not be necessary for us to follow out in its details the idea of the word education in its most general sense, nor to enumerate the various forms in learning, social life, morals and aesthetics. We would only premise that there are two main groups of culture, if we may so express ourselves; which do not necessarily exclude each other, but can exist together, and do often coëxist, yet without the one's intruding upon the domain of the other. Both have in their external form much that is common, so that a cursory observer would easily be led to confound them.

We begin with the education of the practical man. He needs in his capacity of merchant, manufacturer, mechanic, and the like, dexterity in the use of his mental faculties, as memory, understanding, judgment and taste; he must be able to speak and write correctly and fluently his native language, and other modern languages besides, according to the nature of his particular sphere; he must be expert at figures, and have such an acquaintance with geography and history as can be drawn from common text-books. He must study for general discipline, the outlines of all the natural sciences, though some particular one may subsequently become a study for him in detail. If we add to this a certain amount of social and conventional culture, a little music or so, a more intimate acquaintance with our great English classics, and drawing as a preparation for special departments, we have nearly all that can reasonably be demanded of the practical man. These are the foundations of his future profession; this profession he may pursue with honor and profit, if he has mastered it, and the improvements which are successively made in it, and leaves nothing to be learned. He is emphatically a man of the *present*, in its strictest sense, and of the *future*, so far as it rests on this present alone. It is enough for him then to have the culture of his time, as it now is—a settled and an existing *result*. For as he has enough to do with what actually *is*, he has no time and he is under no obligations to inquire how it *became so*. This, of course, is said of a practical man in general without regard to his individual personal situation. *He, therefore, is not at all benefited by the classics;* and we can make no satisfactory answer to parents in Germany who complain of the defects of the gymnasia to which they are nevertheless obliged to send their sons. Of what use, say they, are the Latin and Greek in my case? Furthermore, they are perfectly right in demanding instruction in French as given at the gymnasia. A polished and well-

educated lady once told us in conversation, that her son, who was to be a sailor, needed to know how to swear, but not how to read Greek and Latin.

The case is quite different with scientific[1] culture which we frequently call learning; but incorrectly, for the difference between learning and science is immeasurably great. Learning is the knowledge of what others have done in any branch of study; the more data of this sort one has stored up, pertaining to any department or to several departments at once, the more learned he is. The man of science, on the other hand, is he who can unite by the power of thought these scattered elements into an organic whole, under some higher and guiding fundamental truth. Learning is a lifeless body, unless quickened by science. The usual German appellation is the reverse of the French. While the Germans call all men of science, without distinction, *learned*, the French call all learned men *savans*. In former times few men of learning were men of science; in our day many who call themselves scientific men, look with a proud contempt upon learning; and yet it is the sole condition of science.

It would be superfluous for us to inform our readers that no branch of learning can be properly comprehended, even for practical purposes, without a study of its gradual development; for no branch can assume a fixed place with a relative completeness and perfection, like some of the practical departments. In ceaseless advancement, these studies have been cultivated at different times by different persons, and their form has been perpetually modified by times and men, so that contemporaneous views by scholars of the same nation, have hardly any point of similarity; if we look to other nations the difference is far more striking. For this reason a knowledge of the laborers in each department, and of their respective services, is absolutely necessary. This knowledge furnishes the materials viewed as a matter of learning, and to this part systems belong, which, as an organic whole, are produced only by operations of the intellect, but which become for the independent thinker and inquirer, mere materials of thought furnished by others. If many yield their assent and spontaneously attach themselves to given systems, then what we call schools are formed. We hear of the school of Kant, of Hegel, of philosophical schools, of a historical school of jurisprudence, an abstract school, and so forth.

The man of business then, belonging only to the present time, has to strive only for general culture and for a knowledge of his calling in

[1] For want of a better word we use *science* and *scientific* in this connection, not in their common restricted sense, but with the broader acceptation of the German *Wissenschaft* and *wissenschaftlich*.

keeping with the age. For this purpose the high-schools and the schools for the practical arts are adapted, and in his riper years he visits the professional and polytechnic schools, which are specially and exclusively devoted to men of his class. The man of science, however, as opposed to the merely practical man, resting on the past, needs very different schools from the practical man, both as a general preparative, and as an introduction to the particular branch of study he proposes to pursue. These schools are the Latin schools and gymnasia, and after these have been visited, the universities. Their pupils are to be led to the present by a gradual historical path—by the study of the past, while those of the high-schools and the practical schools are to be immediately introduced to it, without any such study. We refer here particularly to the gymnasia, and those schools which make ancient literature their main study; for at the universities, which in Germany are for the most part professional schools, few attend philological lectures, except those who propose to become teachers. In former times the case was necessarily different.

Taking then a general view of the whole subject, it is at once evident that the science and literature of the present day has descended to us from *Rome;* she at least has furnished the most of the material. She also gave the form, which all the branches of knowledge assumed through the spirit that lives in her language, till the rise of modern literature, when men began to use their own language and to be more independent. The world lay a slave of those mighty Romans for more than a thousand years after their bodies had mouldered in the dust. Who can gaze without reverence and awe at this gigantic spirit, sweeping like a hurricane, the world with its breath, long after the body had perished and gone! It will be enough for our purpose to consider the two great institutions of public life, the State and the Church; in the former we see her historical existence, in the latter her spirit and energies.

The State depends on right, and right is defined by the law. Now the Roman right or *jus* is the foundation of our present jurisprudence, notwithstanding the number of our new law-books, (which would be quite unintelligible by themselves,) and notwithstanding all efforts for the restoration of old national jurisprudence. At the German universities, therefore, it is the main study, and must always be so; and many gymnasia tried to introduce the institutes and history of jurisprudence into their course, though only for those who intended to be law-students; on the same principle that Hebrew is taught only to those who are preparing for the ministry.

In Roman life, which was only a life in the State, we see only the

outward, objective and concrete. The individual torn from the State, appears like the link of a severed chain. His heroic courage forsook him, and though at Rome he would have looked death fearlessly in the face, in banishment he cried and mourned with the pusillanimity of a child. But no sooner was he recalled, than he was quickened with new life, and was again transformed, as with the stroke of a magic wand, into a valiant hero, whom no danger could appall, and no menaces could daunt. The example of Cicero, often as it has been adduced, will serve as an illustration. While still young, he defended amid the minions and satellites of Sulla, Roscius of Ameria, who had been brought into peril of his life by the favorites of the dictator. While consul, he hesitated not a moment to save his republic, at imminent hazard from the abyss into which the conspiracy of Catiline was about to plunge it. But no sooner had Clodius carried the sentence of banishment, so well known, but so indefinite, so vague, so strangely expressed; no sooner did Cicero see a prospect of exile from his beloved Rome, than he puts on mourning, weeps and supplicates, and at last grows utterly dispirited amid tears and lamentations. He will hearken to no consolation; he will not see his brother, and it is painful to read the letters he wrote at this period, as they all breathe the same spirit. This lasted more than a year. Called back to Rome, he is himself again; but he accepts the honorable post of proconsul of Cilicia only with repugnance because it keeps him from Rome. He employs every means after the expiration of the year, to be recalled to Rome. Though given to literary occupations in the retirement of the country, he appears again on the battle-ground, for Antony must be attacked. At the hazard of his life he wrote or delivered his far-famed Philippics, and shortly after looked forth from his litter with such calm composure into the face of Popilius Laenas and his officers, that the stern murderer quailed, and shuddered at executing his bloody work. At last the grey-haired Cicero cried: "Come, veteran! durst thou not strike off an old man's head?" He held his head still and died boldly on the soil of Italy, though he might have saved his life, if he had consented to flee. Like the monster of the old myth, which was invincible as long as it stood on the earth, but raised from it was strangled and died, so was the Roman when his foot rested not in the eternal city, or when he knew himself at variance with her. This type of *objectiveness* Rome impressed upon the Christian church, as soon as its temple was erected there. Many customs and ceremonies were transferred to it, though under different names, and the Roman language, which represents the national character she embodies, still continues to be the language of that church which bears the name of

Roman, and is distinguished from all other churches by its objective character. The principle of justification by works which forms her basis, the telling of beads, her *gratia abundans*, with the merits of the saints, her confessions and her penitence, her outward lord, the pope, and her external pomp attest this objective character as distinguished from the Protestant church, which is a subjective one; subjective to such a degree, that, as matters stand, we should be at a loss to characterize it otherwise than by the 'unity of its members in negation.' The right of free examination it claims, and the free exercise of reason exclude all authority, and allow its members to attach themselves to as many different views as there are persons.

The Catholic church can be understood only in connection with Rome, as the Protestant can be only by that against which it protests, and consequently by that which is connected with Rome.

We see without difficulty how the rays of politics and the church all shot forth from Rome, and how they penetrate all their phases. Hence follows the absolute necessity for those who devote themselves to the State or the church, to proceed from Rome to modern times. There alone can they procure the passport without which they cannot reach their journey's end in safety. To the same necessity the physician is subjected, the philosopher, in short, every one who devotes himself to scientific studies; this, however, it is not essential to show at length, if the essence and aim of scientific education, as we have exhibited them above, be granted as true.

We may here conveniently meet an objection, more specious than true, that has often been urged, but only by such as judge without a well-grounded personal knowledge, and so grasp the shadow instead of the substance. It is said that to gain this acquaintance with Rome the study of its history is sufficient. This objection is so entirely false, and yet so entirely true, according to the view with which it is made, that we must discuss it more fully.

If by history is meant the deeds and outward fortunes of a people, the knowledge of their great men and the like, as they are to be learned from the text-books and manuals of modern authors, the objection is utterly false and void. The famous saying of Buffon: "Le style —c'est l'homme," in its simple grandeur and truth, is so applicable that we may take it as the foundation on which to build our argument.

The *nature of man* has of necessity been essentially the same at all times and among all nations, and it is to-day what it will be for all future time; it is therefore something universal, on which neither country nor climate nor education can have the slightest effect; for these influences modify only its particular form at a given time, and

in this particular form what we call character, consists. The nature and history of nations, is like that of individual man; like him they are the children, the productions of their time and their place, and receive the special form under which they appear, alike in all main points, from the influences mentioned above. From this it is evident, on the one hand, that deeds, heroes, and the like, considered in themselves, are but points, not united by any line. Caesar, Miltiades, Hermann, were all warriors, and one in the place of another would without doubt have gained the same renown. But why the one was a Roman, the other a Greek, the third a German, is only to be learned from the soul that animated them respectively; the form however which each has assumed, in which he manifests himself and has an outward existence, is his greatest, his most divine action,—his language. The language of a nation is the manifestation of its inmost nature. To study the language of a nation is to listen to the nation in the laboratory of its soul, the most secret recesses of its heart, and to detect the slightest beat. This is true of style in itself, that is of the characteristic way of uniting in sentences single words, the original elements, and of uniting the sentences in periods, and the periods in a continuous discourse. We speak therefore of a Latin, a French, a German style, and again of the style of Cicero, of Rousseau, of Göthe, as the characteristic way in which these writers have individually shaded and shaped the form of the national genius,—the form which in this respect is common and universal. But this is equally true not only of style in its more restricted sense, but of the way of viewing and expressing single objects; and though this field, opened rather than exhausted, is not yet measured, it contains the richest treasures, which a happy future is to bring to light. The material, concrete Roman, avoiding all idealism, formed his *homo* from *humus*, designating him therefore as the *earth-born*, the intellectual Greek expressed the same idea by *ἄνθρωπος*, the *up-looker*, the German by *Mensch*, doubtless from the Greek *μήν; Mensch* means then the *intelligent.* All these words evidently present the same meaning, but from quite different points of view.

We cannot show this more plainly, than by borrowing the words of Mager, counsellor of education and formerly professor of French literature at the gymnasium at Aarau; we take the liberty therefore of quoting them here. He says in the introduction to his excellent Book and Exercises on the German Language (Deutsch Sprachbuch):[1]

"The human family divides itself into several races, each race into

[1] Stuttgart, Cast, 1842, pp. 2 and 3.

several nations, each nation into several stocks. If nations then living at a wide distance apart do not express the same ideas by the same sounds, this need not excite our wonder. (Multiplicity of languages.) But as reason is common to all men, we might imagine that languages would differ only in employing different appellations, as for instance *bellum*, *guerre*. Were this the case, one who wished to learn foreign languages, would only be obliged to learn the corresponding foreign appellation for every appellation in his mother-tongue, and then he could both understand and speak the foreign tongue. But the case is quite different. Two things are here to be considered.

"All objects in the material and intellectual world offer to man more than one side on which they can be viewed, and from which they can be named. Let us take what we will, father, man, crow, wolf, bow, etc.; each of these objects has numerous peculiarities, and is seen in many states. Now to name an object, the language must select some one peculiarity or state of the object, and take the name from that. Thus *father* is the nurturer, *man* the thinking being, *crow* the croaker, *wolf* the robber, *bow* the bent, etc. But though one language selects from an object *one* peculiarity or condition, and applies a name in conformity with it, another peculiarity or another condition in the same object may be selected in a different language, and then the appellations of the two tongues do not coïncide; they *designate* the same thing but do not *signify* the same; thus the German says *Schlange*, (snake), *Floh*, (flea); he notices and indicates in these animals their *winding* (schlingen), and *fleeing*, while the Roman calls the animal we call *Schlange*, the *creeper* (serpens), and the Dane calls the flea the *runner* (loppe). The Germans say *Getraide* (grain); in this word is intimated that the object it designates is borne (*getragen*) by the earth; the same thing is called by the Romans *frumentum*, and is conceived of as *fruit*, as something the earth offers for our enjoyment. We say *king* (German, *König*); this word originally designates the head of a clan; the Roman *rex* means the *ruler*. The German word *Tugend* (virtue) comes from *Taugen*, the Roman *virtus* is *manliness* from *vir*. In the German language *Korn* has a wide acceptation, in the Swedish *korn* means barley, and the German *Johannisbeere* is in that language *vinbär*, and *biörk*, *birch*, in Icelandic means *tree* in general. It often happens also that different languages apply to an object exactly the same name. *Fluss* in German and *fluvius* in Latin are the *flowing*. *Fürst* and *princeps* the *First*. We see from these examples that different languages do not always coïncide in the representation of ideas; they often *conceive* of the same thing, but do not

express the same; the appellations designate the same object, but do not convey the same shade of meaning.

"The second thing to be considered is this:

Where we say	*I shall* write,
the Frenchman says in two words;	*j'écrir-ai*
and the Roman in one,	scrib-*am;*
Our	*I have* written
is in Latin,	scrip-s-i;
Our	*I am* read
is in Latin,	leg-*or.*

"So we say, 'I know that I may err;' this idea the Roman expresses by, 'I know myself to be able to err.' What we (i. e. the Germans) express as follows: 'Cicero of whom I believe that he was consul,' is in Latin and English, 'Cicero whom I believe to have been consul.' The Germans say, 'We meet to (dative) a friend;' the French and English, 'We meet a friend.' The Germans say of the *sun, she,* of the *moon, he,* in Latin and French and English it is just the reverse.

"From these examples we see, first, that there are certain ideas frequently occurring (e. g. Present, Past, Future, the suffering of an action; the *I, thou,* etc.), which one language expresses by special words, another merely by changes or inflections; secondly, that different languages do not always unite words in the same way and by the same means."

So far Mager. We see that here alone the *spirit* of a people predominates, and that with every acquisition of a foreign language a new spirit, that is, a new, peculiar form of the universal spirit in man is unfolded, and that this is greatly enriched by the attainment of so invaluable a possession. *What* Caesar, Miltiades or Hermann have done, or *what* Cicero, Demosthenes or Göthe have said and written, is, in itself, of no consequence, because we cannot prove that other men of the same nation, or of other nations, could not have done, written or said the same; but the *manner* in which they have done it, the *way* in which they have said it, is the sole characteristic of the man, for it is the shell of the individual genius which produces deeds and words. If this great truth admits no doubt, many of the above-mentioned objections, brought against the study of ancient literature by the advocates of practical learning, are completely refuted. No translation of a writer into another language—be it ever so good,—can give even a glimpse of this genius, and no manual of history can give an idea of the history of a nation, without a knowledge of their language in which it is imaged forth. We can, to be sure, acquire from trans-

lations the substance of some true and fine thoughts, and we can obtain information from works of history about facts and exploits. But the study of the language alone discloses the genius which produces them.

The whole being of the Roman is made up of *life in the State*, the objective, actual, concrete. So is his language. A stranger to abstractions, (which increase and predominate in proportion as it becomes corrupted by time and circumstances, and under the emperors, when the Roman ceased to be a Roman, grows so degenerate that it moves in pointed antitheses and witty hemistichs,) it proceeds in measured periods, moulded with the greatest art, yet easily comprehended at a glance, with the subject standing at the head, and the verb guarding the end. All defenceless and subordinate parts must be placed between these two bulwarks. Nothing can be appended, to disturb this order. With few exceptions every word forms a distinct, concrete idea: that conciseness which Livy was so fond of in the participial constructions, and the later writers far more than he, is unknown to Cicero and Cæsar, though prototypes of the Roman language. This is strictly true, however, only of Cicero as an *orator*, for the same Cicero was compelled in his capacity of *philosopher*, to take lessons of the Greeks, and after their example to coin a large quantity of words after the analogy of the Greeks, principally verbals, and in general abstracts of all kinds, which as elements foreign to the Roman tongue, (as indeed all philosophy, dealing in abstractions, is,) disfigure the fine concrete language of the great orator. After him the later writers vied with one another, we may almost say with passionate zeal, to outstrip him, and this effort had such results that within a hundred years after his death the Latin tongue was no longer like itself.

It is remarkable that Christianity, teeming with spiritual freedom, supplanted the legal religion of the Jews, just at the time that the language of law, the Roman sunk to decay; for as we have observed, Cicero is properly its keystone.

Now this objective, concrete character of the Latin, has, besides its undeniable historic consequence to the learned man, what we may call an educating power which displays itself to us in two forms, as an *introduction to abstract thinking*, which is peculiar to our times, and serve instinctively as an *effectual means of moral cultivation*, in which the scholar may reasonably be expected to be in advance of his contemporaries, whatever profession he may select.

At the first hasty glance it might seem as if all education should be carried onward from the earliest historical starting point, that is, it must begin with Greece, then be guided through Rome, and finally

closed with the Teutonic; so that with the access of new elements the former should live on. This, however, is a serious error, which would produce great evil. The young man even at the age when he is entrusted to the gymnasium has already entered the ante-chamber of modern abstractions; for these have so penetrated and leavened everything, that hardly any age, and no class in society, fails of using them, at least unconsciously. We speak of the *capture* of this or that fortress, of the *foundation* of Rome, like every body else in the world, and only the disciplined scholar is aware of the abstractions that lie in these expressions. The *foundation*, for instance, means nothing more than the *act of founding*, the *founding* in its continuance and duration, which we should always keep in view, even when we employ the word to designate the result of the act. The Roman, in his concrete language, speaks altogether differently. He calls such and such a year after the *foundation of Rome*, post urbem *conditam*, that is, after the already founded and still standing Rome.

Now nothing can be understood and comprehended without its opposite; there were no life without death, no day without the night. To the boy, then, already more or less familiar with his abstract mother-tongue, its opposite, the concrete Latin, must be presented. The more he penetrates into the nature of this language, the further he proceeds in his own, so that the start he has made in it becomes of great importance. Without the discipline of rigid thought, which a comprehension of the genius of the Latin tongue insures, he would be lost in the mazes of abstraction, and his thoughts would soar into the regions of mist, for want of a firm ground to stand upon. For in such a study lies the sole condition of that true freedom of thinking which rests on law as a foundation; not the freedom which forms the vague watch-word of the day; for this freedom is mere licentiousness which despises the law.

But if the study of Latin literature is to effect this great object, (which it can effect,) it must be pursued thoroughly. We ought then, finally, to begin to *banish all manuals and exercise-books* which would palm off the Latinity of *their own authors*. By their barbarisms, by their violations of the genius of the Latin tongue, they give the mind an entirely false direction, and quite destroy, instead of quickening it. Furthermore, we must *discard all manuals and exercise-books that are patched up from writers of all periods*, from poets and prose-writers. It seems very plausible, but in reality amounts to nothing, when such authors repeat, again and again, that they are far from all *one-sided* views; no foreigner (they say), who wished to learn German, would strive to copy the language of Göthe or Schiller, syllable for syllable; every

reasonable man would wish rather to acquire the German common to all educated men of Göthe and Schiller's time; and, to conclude, such a course is of no use for beginners. But what would the enemies of a *one-sided* course say if one should take a notion to put manuals into the hands of young German children at school, (for that, in spite of the difference of years, corresponds exactly with the commencement of a Latin course,) made up of a mosaic of words and phrases, not merely of extracts, taken from the Nibelungen-Lied, the Minnesingers and Mastersingers, the Reformers, the Silesian schools of poets, and all the writers of a later age? In fact, however, those enemies of a *one-sided* course proceed in a way no less ridiculous and far more injurious; for time would bring a remedy for such a mistaken course in German, but in Latin, a language which is no longer used in daily life, time would but render the evil greater. What can they say who would have the language common to all educated Romans at the time of Cicero and Caesar, not that of those Romans alone, if we asked them for other sources to draw from, sources which have no existence? To be sure, if we could be present at a Thée dansant at Marcus Tullius Cicero's, or a Partie l'Hombre at the Soirées of Julius Caesar, or would the Sosii, (now alas! so deaf,) but send us the newest sheets of privileged Roman journals of fashion, or the wet leaves of romances and novels of the best times of the republic; in that case we should find no trouble about the language of the educated, and we could not only learn the genuine *accent de* Rome, (like the *accent d' Orleans* in the good times of the ancien régime,) but we should know how to employ the most tasteful and latest fold of the toga romana to cover our nudity. Unfortunately, however, such is not the case; we have nothing to rely upon beyond Cicero and Caesar, and we cannot perceive and distinguish, in other writers what is universal and what is peculiar, as many imagine and pretend. But luckily this is not at all essential; should one but drink in the droppings of the Roman genius to be found in the remnants of Cicero's and Caesar's writings, he would have more than enough by way of preparatory discipline, to employ the labors of a whole life; everything else would fall away of itself. The feeling of the Ciceronians, so called, correct in itself, is rendered absurd only by the circumstance, that it led them to the foolish task of adapting the expressions of a thousand years back to convey the ideas of a totally different age. As long as a wig remains a wig, it cannot be dressed up so as to become a modern beaver-hat. But if it be thought that the pure spirit of man, and such is that of the beginner, may be contaminated by corrupt materials, this seems to us like wicked mockery, like impious blasphemy; we can only pardon

those who think so, on the ground that they know not what they do. The soul of a youth is something sacred; to defile it is worse than to defile the temple *men* have raised in honor of God; God the Holy One, has built it himself. But nothing is unimportant in the work of completing and adorning the temple which God has entrusted to us. The small is no less important than the great, because nothing is great or small where everything is equally necessary to the whole. So also in science, every part is equally essential.

A course of instruction in Latin, pursued according to our views,—excluding all practical aims, such as the use of Latin as a universal language, or for writing and speaking on literary and scientific subjects of the day, or the purposes of common life, views which haunt the brains of many only from reverence for hoary traditions, in spite of all the admonitions to the contrary which come from every quarter. Indeed the time when these traditions were more than traditions, when they rested on substantial grounds, has passed. This course of instruction above indicated, which pursuing earnestly only the one thing necessary, that is, surveying in its details as well as in its whole character the Roman mind as it stands forth in wondrous majesty; such a course cannot fail to be a *palaestra* in which the pupil, by wrestling with the genius of Rome, becomes acquainted not only with that, but with his own inward nature; the spirit will continue to hide him under its pinions when deceitful clouds shall afterwards threaten to envelop him; and it will hover around him unseen, when the consciousness of its concrete form fades or vanishes in the dawn of the new day. The practical theologian, lawyer or physician need not excuse himself by saying that he has no time to read the Latin classics; for if his training at school has effected what it should, its purposes must have been fulfilled with its conclusion; and if one's inclination or business do not lead him to pursue these studies in after life, he need not trouble himself further about them.

We have yet to speak of the moral training the Latin affords. What we in general call character is the individual form in which the individual man appears, as a particular link in the great chain of humanity, his nation, his race and his time. Besides the natural disposition, that is, the relations in which the faculties of the mind and heart stand to one another, education and instruction combined with life itself contribute most to human development. Different as individuals and their characters may be, they have yet all a common ground as education has a common end. The aim of education is the development and establishment of moral freedom; and this freedom is the union of the subjective desire with the objective law. The child, inasmuch as

it still obeys only the dictates of nature, strives only for what is agreeable to it or what promises to become so; it does not distinguish between the hurtful and the useful, the right and the wrong. When its education is properly conducted, it is compelled at an early age to obey without questioning the law, that is an authority from without, the will of its parents, that it may become accustomed to bow before the might of the law, and to recognize it as a thing to which it is subject, to obey it however opposed to its subjective will and pleasure. The nearer education approaches its true aim, the more will his improvement and advanced ripeness assist him in following the dictates of reason which his parents and teachers helped to establish in him, and in voluntarily fulfilling the law with the same acquiescence as when he was compelled so to do. Were then human weakness not in the way both of teachers and taught, man would infallibly conquer and suppress his animal desires to obey the law ever, without exception, yet not from compulsion but from the unrestrained impulses of reason; for this as such *can* desire nothing but the right. In this way the fundamental law of Christianity would be fulfilled; for the love it teaches is nothing more than the freedom we have described.

Now at the very time when impulses from without still continue to urge the youth to the fulfilment of the law, when he himself is beginning to see the reasons for it, though to a limited extent, and involuntarily to bow before its might, his Latin education begins,—*the study of that national character, which, in its purity, appears as the law itself.* Who does not see the beneficial effects this must have upon the youth? For though the immediate seat of the character is in the moral sphere, the intellectual powers have a vital and essential connection with it, since no part of the inward man can be affected, without affecting all the rest. The contemplation and study of the law, this logical discipline, as it may be called, must influence powerfully the morals and the will, and impress and strengthen the whole character.

It is not our plan to suggest a system of education in Latin; we have tried rather only to show its importance for our times. But as it may appear that we confine the study of this language within too narrow bounds, we must expressly protest against such an interpretation. As much as we are convinced that Cicero and Caesar are the Romans who exhibit the genius of their nation in its purest form, and who must always be the main sources of the mental cultivation that is to be drawn from the Latin; we are nevertheless far from opposing the study of the poets, and the other prose writers as Sallust, Livy and Tacitus, when the powers of the pupil are developed and trained

to reflection. They will then easily perceive that with the exception perhaps of Tibullus and Ovid there is hardly one genuine Latin poet, and that from the nature of things there could not be. In the prose-writers they can mark the speedy disappearance of the Roman mind, after its mission was fulfilled, and learn to comprehend it the better from its own counterpart.

As to writing Latin, we have already expressed our views of its importance in another place; here then we would but say, that it amounts to nothing more than the proof to an arithmetical solution. The more competent one is to reproduce the Roman form of thought, the further he has entered into the dwelling-place of the Roman mind. The nature of these exercises is what our ancestors called *imitations*, however unpleasantly the name may sound. Individual, characteristic style is a nonentity when a modern strives for it in a dead language. The need of Latin for practical purposes has long ceased to exist, since it has finally been conceded,—at least tacitly, and in practice—that every man in representing the ideas of his time must choose a corresponding form, either his mother tongue or some other modern language of equal cultivation.

The speaking of Latin, on the other hand, has scarcely any good results to set off against the great injury it does. The greatest *stylists* of modern times, men like *Ruhnken* and *Ernesti*, have never spoken Latin, because they had learned the inexpressible difficulty of only writing tolerably. If it was a hard task for them what will it be for others, who cannot hope to compare with them? And what sort of Latin will they speak? A spoken language, we must admit, is brought nearer to the mind of the speaker; and if it is a dead language, it is in a measure raised to life. But such a life as this lies always in the agonies of death. Lest the reader of these lines may imagine that I am speaking according to the maxim, Nulla ars habet osorem nisi ignorantem, I would observe—but for this reason alone—that I speak Latin daily in teaching, and that those who hear or have heard me, ascribe to me a more than common facility in this art. Nevertheless I must acknowledge that I have often been ashamed and vexed at seeing my education, whatever it may be, and that of others judged by my ability to speak Latin. This fluency is admired in the pupils of the Jesuit colleges, as for instance that of Freiburg in Switzerland. They speak with great readiness, but how! "Sciunt, *quod* hic aut illic accusativus cum infinitivo *stare debet.*"

We have hitherto in our remarks on the value of the Latin language for our age, confined ourselves to the gymnasia, its special nurses; and from the course of these observations, it will be evident

that according to our views the system of instruction there must be a grammatical one, if it is to produce fruit. The term *grammatical* we use in a broad sense, including in it an attention to the meaning of words and synonymes. The study of synonymes, however, must not be one which establishes, *à priori*, hair-breadth distinctions, which the least reading at once overthrows.

A course of school education which regards the Roman writers as compendiums of history, geography, archaeology and aesthetics must be absolutely ruinous to the young; for paradoxical as it may sound, it is nevertheless true, that we must seek in them compendiums of grammar, manuals of the *form* in which the Roman mind displays itself.

At the universities the lectures in which the Roman authors are interpreted are no longer regularly attended even by young philologists. A genial age seeks genial and philosophical modes of instruction, and prefers to erect a literary structure without foundation, or rather to take in ready-made, what can only be wrung out by painful industry; it would rather speculate than investigate. Under these peculiar circumstances we can bring this part of our subject to a speedy close, and need but to hint that if the gymnasium has properly followed and attained its aim, the university must attend to the development of the whole body of *Roman literature*, and must estimate every writer as the product of his age according to matter and manner, that the student now outwardly free—and free too he should be within,—may learn to glance over the whole domain, that he may hereafter understand with more certainty the particular branch to which he devotes himself.

While the Roman represents the objective, the Greek represents the subjective. This is attested not only by the whole political system of this nation, by which it was divided into a multitude of little States with entirely different institutions, but also by the language of the nation. While all genuine Romans show a common form of language and style so that individual characters are hardly to be recognized, among the vast number of Greek writers not two are to be found alike. Each one appears in his own individuality so sharply defined, moulded so plastically, we may say, that we can compare with them in this respect none but the Teutonic writers, different as the reasons for this phenomenon may be among Greeks and the Teutonic race. Furthermore no other instance is to be found in the languages of civilized nations, of different dialects coëxisting with equal pretension, as

in the Greek, which was divided into four chief dialects, the Ionic, Doric, Attic and Aeolic. The language itself, finally, is so unrestrained, and moves so pliantly in its loose fetters, that it is a point of the highest difficulty for the grammarian to deduce its laws, which are all modified by the great number of exceptions, and often to such an extent, that the examples accompanying the exception are as numerous as those under the rule. The whole language is penetrated and animated by countless ramifications of nerve-like particles, with the nicest shades of meaning, which in many places altogether defy our attempts to understand them.

The wondrously organized Greek displays this subjective element in its ideal, art, whose source and main principle, *beauty*, can never be defined but always felt by the susceptible and refined. All arts, at least the greater number, by far, attained under his fostering hand the highest degree of perfection and splendor. We have but to think of the Greek architects, who built their temples, of the sculptors who chiseled their statues, of their gem-engravers, of their painters and of their poets, poets such as no after ages have produced or will produce. This universal feeling of beauty, this living and moving in its being is seen also in the Greek writers who devoted themselves to the serious tasks of philosophy and history, to say nothing of the orators to whom it is natural and necessary.

Since now the scholar must thoroughly comprehend himself and his age, we must admit that the study of the Greek is indispensably necessary for the acquisition of such culture, though it would prove injurious if begun before a certain knowledge of Latin were attained. The protestant gymnasia of Germany follow in this respect the proper course, prescribed by the nature of the case.

Though the Roman character is as peculiar and distinctive as that of the Greeks, it necessarily borrowed a multitude of Greek elements, as history sufficiently teaches in the settlement of Italy by Greeks and their constant influence in Italy. This is seen most immediately in the Latin language, which is not only a branch of that great eastern trunk from which the Teutonic too shoots forth, but is penetrated through and through with the Grecian leaven. This fact appears likewise in Roman religion and mythology. Modern times have their foundation in Rome, Rome has hers in Greece; consequently, a knowledge of Greece is indispensably necessary to a knowledge of Rome. We need not here repeat what we have said above, in speaking of Rome; for *mutatis mutandis* it will all apply to Greece as the origin of Rome.

Freedom is a union of the subjective desire with the outward law.

When the boy begins to learn Latin, he is at that stage of his being which is represented by the Greek, and then the aim is to awaken him to the existence and authority of the law. The Latin is therefore in its proper place. But to reconcile the objective law with freedom, a second thing is necessary, a *conscious* recognition of his inner or subjective nature, that natural necessity, which begins to rule unperceived by him, with his first breath, and would accompany him, were it not checked, to his last hour. Alas! it does accompany many men even to their graves. This consciousness of his primeval nature nothing can impart better than the study of Greek. Experience speaks loud enough here for those who cannot penetrate deeper. In the Jesuit-schools and those of Catholic countries which do not participate in the protestant system of education, the confession of objective Christianity has of itself suppressed these studies, in spite of the zeal with which Greek was pursued in Italy at the restoration of letters. No isolated instance to the contrary, like that of Thiersch in Munich, is strong enough to refute this, as the necessary result, and no one that knows the earlier philologists of Italy will call them good Catholics.

Writers like Cicero and Caesar were a thing impossible in Greece. Though we confine ourselves to these two authors in studying the genius of the Roman people, we must allow and even require a wider choice in the study of Greek. Above all, the poets deserve our attention, because in them we see the clearest manifestation of real Greek culture, as we do that of the Romans in the historian Caesar, and the orator Cicero. Here too the gymnasia must unfold the language, and the university the literature in its representatives. For the antiquities of both nations the studies at any classical school will suffice; but it would be more profitable if the historical lessons were immediately connected with the grammatical, since the language and the history of a nation are *one*.

As to writing Greek,—for most institutions have abandoned all attempts at speaking it,—our age is returned to the proper point of view; for it is only practised for the purpose of impressing on the student the most essential principles of grammar, including etymological and syntactical forms; though some years back, a noble enthusiasm, well enough in itself, carried it beyond this point, and fancied it possible for pupils to write and for teachers to correct original compositions and orations in Greek.

The above-mentioned protestant gymnasia have also, in our opinion, established a proper proportion between the Greek and Latin; it is not right to make the number of lessons equal, as is done in many Swiss schools. And he who feels called to devote his after years ex-

clusively to Greek studies, will find sufficient preparation under the arrangements of the protestant schools.

As the Christian Teutonic character proceeds from this union of the subjective Greek with the objective Latin, a truth which cannot be fully demonstrated here; the Teutonic languages, which are the impress of the Teutonic mind, must each unite in itself the Greek freedom and the Roman formality. After the establishment of Christianity, which is the religion of freedom, guiding the whole will of man to the fulfilment of the law, and thus soaring above the law, the various German nations were united under the German emperor, and are now again united by the German Confederation; consequently, particular dialects are no longer employed by men of education in writing and speech; they are merged in the High German; and this High German blends the formality of the Latin with the suppleness of the Greek in such a way that every writer of character and originality can impress his individuality upon the common Teutonic basis. But we must refrain from expatiating on other points,—the arts, for instance, which in their various kinds among the Teutonic race approach in their perfection those of the Greeks, though they do not equal them, and jurisprudence and law, which is not far behind the Roman law. Thus much is certain—that Latin and Greek must be retained, if we would properly understand our own glorious tongue. As a State of southern Germany has lately inquired into the expediency of making Greek elective, and requiring it only of philologists and theologians, it is to be hoped that the answers to this question will satisfactorily show, that the proposed limitation would cut off an essential element of scientific culture. Its loss would soon be generally felt and gratify that false liberty, or radicalism that offers death for life. From this may our country be preserved, and not be deterred by any foolish clamor from proceeding by the safe path of history to a more glorious development and a clearer understanding of itself.

ARTICLE III.

STUDIES IN HEBREW POETRY.[1]

By Prof. B. B. Edwards.

Age of the Alphabetical Poems.

When we investigate the unknown forms of ancient poetry, it must be regarded as an advantage if we meet with anything, proceeding from the authors or their times, which exhibits an authentic division of the verses. Dispensing with conjecture and experiment as to the manner in which the text is to be separated into members, we can at once examine the condition of the single divisions of the verses, the incidental grouping of them into strophes, and the entire external structure of the poem; and from these observations, we can look at the other poems and see how far the same or similar forms may be revealed in them, and thus enlarge and complete our inquiries. Such an advantage is furnished to the student in the field of ancient Hebrew poetry by those alphabetic poems whose external form is distinguished by the alphabetic arrangement regularly appearing at the beginning of each verse or group of verses. We have no inconsiderable number of them. They are Psalms 9 and 10, 25, 34, 37, 111, 112, 119, 145, Prov. 31: 10—31, Lam. 1—4. Hence an inquiry on the form of Hebrew poetry has to begin with these; especially the preliminary question, whether the Hebrew poets in general composed in prescribed forms, must here first find its solution. Still, before we proceed to the examination of these poems, it will be proper to ascertain the age of this alphabetic structure, since on this may depend the utility of the results. If the alphabetic Psalms as such belong to the latest period of Hebrew poetry, then the conclusion in respect to the forms of these pieces, in relation to those of the older poems, would be the more doubtful from the fact that they have been assigned to a period when true poetry was extinct, and an artificial structure had usurped the place of a free poetic inspiration, and thus a form foreign to the old poetry may have been introduced. Certainly in this respect modern critics have passed a judgment on this species of poems in

[1] Condensed and translated from a volume published at Bonn in 1846, entitled, "Biblische Abhandlungen von J. G. Sommer, Licentiaten v. Theol. u. Privatdocenten an der Rhein. Universität zu Bonn," pp. 373.

the highest degree unfavorable. De Wette, in his Introduction to the Psalms, remarks: "I consider the alphabetic arrangement as a contrivance of the rhythmical art, a product of a later and corrupted taste. When the spirit of poetry has flown, men cling to the lifeless body, the rhythmical form, and seek in this to supply the want. As a matter of fact, almost all the alphabetic poems are remarkable for want of connection (which I regard as a consequence, not as the cause of the alphabetic arrangement), by the ordinary style of the thoughts, by coldness and languor of emotion, and by a low and sometimes an artificial phraseology." So in particular Psalms of an alphabetic structure, this structure is made to serve as a mark of a late authorship. Thus these poems do not come into the period of fresh, living poetry, as the mass of the remainder do, but into the period, when in the place of poetic originality and of freedom, imitation, toilsome combinations and efforts for artificial forms, were introduced;—consequently in the last period of Hebrew poetry.

We cannot assent to this view. To affirm absolutely that the alphabetic Psalms are a later product of Hebrew poetry, which originated when the proper poetic spirit had vanished, is an assertion which on a more exact examination, cannot be substantiated. We may first look at the Lamentations of Jeremiah, in which we shall find a form of alphabetic structure so developed and ingenious, that no one can regard it as a first essay of the kind. In respect to the time of the authorship of this work, it may be said that no doubt would avail in favor of any period which would be in opposition to the well-grounded tradition that Jeremiah was the author. For these poems are manifestly the expression of a still fresh and violent grief over the very recent sack of the holy city and the temple by the Chaldeans. Now had not the alphabetic form been already long current, (and that this was the case is confirmed by the elaborated structure of the verses and strophes which we meet with in these poems,) then we cannot see how this poet should have hit on the plan of including his deep-felt lamentations in an alphabetical arrangement. At all events, it must have been a method altogether common, and employed in various ways; else we should not have met with it here, certainly not in this skilful form. Consequently the alphabetic structure of the verses, in origin as well as in development, does not belong to the period of the exile, but without doubt to an earlier time. Or can we believe that poetry fell with the fall of the State, and that of course the end of genuine poetry is to be placed before the period of the exile? Indeed it is a common opinion that from the time of the exile down, the intellectual power of the Israelites was broken, and that immediately

after the exile, the Rabbinic period began. It is Ewald's opinion that the fall of genuine poetry and the increasing toilsome efforts in pursuit of learning occur at the end of the seventh and at the beginning of the sixth century B. C., as he allows none of the alphabetic psalms an earlier authorship. But we cannot well speak of a fall of art, of the sinking of genuine poetry, of the vanishing of the true poetic spirit, since we certainly possess numerous poems belonging to this period and the next following, which may be reckoned among the noblest specimens of Hebrew poetry. And if we look at the internal history of Israel, it could hardly be otherwise, for that antagonism or opposition, which in the times of the kings was directed to the developing of the spirit of the people and to keeping it awake, always becoming more definite and clear,—(an opposition between the theocracy and anti-theocracy extending even among the adherents of the national worship—) grew more intense not only towards the end of this period, but became involved with other mutually hostile influences which must have deeply touched and aroused the feelings of the Hebrews. To a party that despised the ancient worship, attached itself to a foreign religion and allowed itself in every wilful and unrighteous act, the pious worshippers of Jehovah became an occasion of vexation and offence, so much the more as the tendencies of this irreligious party were condemned and exposed in their native hatefulness. The hostility resulted to the prejudice of the friends of the theocracy, since the party of the "wicked," superior in number, and influential by wealth and power, were in a situation to show their hatred in the most emphatic manner. The pious, for the most part, actually poor, suffering and wretched, had their only strength and joy in their well-tried faith, in their reverence for God prescribed by law, and in the sanctuary, their centre of union. To appear before Jehovah and to bewail their trouble, to confirm one another in fidelity, to gain instruction on the empty prosperity of the wicked, to make known in hymns their overthrow and the certain salvation of the righteous;—this was the field in which the most eminent of this portion of the people moved. These hostile feelings increased the nearer the period of the exile approached. The expected judgment, which should destroy the wicked, came, but both the pious and wicked were alike involved. The religious feelings underwent a transformation, former hopes were broken, and from the perplexed contests and experiences of the inner life sprang forth new feelings,—humility and self-denial, deep seated love and trust towards the God of the fathers, whom there was a surer prospect of soon again worshipping at the place of his sanctuary. Where there is so wide a separation, and where the feel-

ings of the heart are in pursuit of a fresh happiness, there poetry, which sympathizes with all the great movements of the soul and is the vitally fresh expression of them, may never be seized with dissolution.

There still belongs to that period, and shortly before the catastrophe, among other compositions, the ode of Habakkuk, which is to be reckoned among the finest in Hebrew poetry. Out of this period have also sprung a greater part of those poems expressing feelings full of boldness and confidence, complaints, and prayers for deliverance from an oppression which had gone to the utmost extremity, and which was inflicted by the enemies of the theocracy. To a somewhat later time, when the destruction of the State and the carrying away of captives had already commenced, belong Ps. 42 and 43, likewise a true master-piece of Hebrew poetry, remarkable for fresh and deep feeling, originality in expression, lively delineation and skilful completion; also Ps. 44, the work of a not less richly endowed poet; also Psalms 59, 60, 61, 74, 89, etc. If we should form our conclusion in regard to the poetry of that time from the remains which have reached us, our judgment can only be favorable, so that poetry then, not less than in earlier times, found a various nurture, and sharing in the movements of the external and inward life, preserved its originality, freshness and creative power.

We also possess some good poems of the time immediately succeeding the exile, so that that event was not a turning point in the poetical life of the people. The hostile opinions and divisions which had existed in earlier periods, continued through the exile, and with interests and views similar to those which the pious part of the nation had before entertained, the people proceeded to the reörganization of the State. A long time later, as the Israelites had become firmly reestablished in the Holy Land, and as they began to feel that all the former hostile divisions had disappeared, then first occurred a transformation of the popular life which had been gradually preparing—that tendency towards the external observances of the law, the exposition of which now took away all fresh, intellectual, and, especially, poetic life. This period, however, after which there was only a dying or dead poetry among the Israelites, cannot be placed before the exile. It is to be put after that event; and what belongs to this learned epoch, that is the later, is easily distinguished in general from all which originated in the old or middle periods. The question, therefore, whether the alphabetic Psalms as such belong to the later Hebrew poetry, has been already decided in the negative. The alphabetic structure in itself is no mark of the late authorship of a poem. In the first and oldest book of the Psalter, we find the alphabetic

Psalms, 9, 10, 25, 34, 37. They bear David's name, and must have been regarded as ancient, by the collector of them.

They may be divided into six classes; 1. Those where every line of a verse begins with a new letter in alphabetic order; 2. Where the beginning of every other line follows the alphabetic arrangement, Prov. 31: 10—13; 3. Where every fourth line begins with the letter, see the beginning of Ps. 37; 4. This is seen in the structure of Ps. 119. The letter returns eight times and denotes the beginning of every first, third, fifth, etc. line; 5. This is found in the first two chapters of Lamentations. Each strophe has three verses, which a caesura for the most part divides into two unequal parts, and at the beginning of the strophe stands the letter; 6. This is found in Lam. ch. 3. The form of the verses and strophes is like that of the preceding, but the letter stands at the beginning of each of the three verses.

Rhyme in Hebrew Popular Poetry.

Rhyme, in the more extended sense, by which we here understand only a designed correspondence of sound in the final syllables of verses, was not wholly unknown to the Hebrews, yet, as it has been commonly viewed, not employed. Older scholars, indeed, influenced by the later Jewish poetry, maintained that the correspondence in the final sounds was an esssential part in ancient poetry. Le Clerc, e. g. affirms in his essay on Hebrew poetry: "asserimus poesin Heb. non nisi in versibus *ὁμοιοτελεύτοις* iisdemque valde irregularibus consistere." Still, in opposition to him, it has been shown that a similarity in sound, resembling rhyme, might very easily occur, without design, in connection with like-sounding suffixes and the endings of verbs and nouns, especially in the parallelism of Hebrew poetry. Now were this consonance of final syllables found in no large poem, in a continued series, but only here and there and rarely introduced, then it might be ascribed more correctly to accident than to design.[1] Accordingly no place in general has been given to rhyme in Hebrew poetry. The old Hebrew, it is said, was too great in its simplicity, as well as too earnest for this jingling play.[2] Still, in my opinion, such a difference does not exist between the natural, rough popular poetry and that of cultivated, higher, more earnest poetry. In the remains of the

[1] So among the older writers, Sal. van Til in d. Sing—u. Spiel—Kunst d. Heb. II. 6. § 4, and Carpzov Int. II. 18. Comp. Saalschütz Form d. Heb. Poes. § 61.

[2] Ewald Poet. Bücher des A. T. I. 63. Comp. still p. 79: "with the same right as in regard to metrical syllables, we may seek in the Old Testament for rhyme, which nowhere, in no verses, can be shown to be designed, and which is wholly foreign to the old Heb. poetry."

old popular poetry, the rhyme or the assonance, in the final sounds of verse, almost uniformly appears, and hence may be regarded as belonging to it. To the earnestness and solemn dignity of religious poetry, the rhyme might certainly not seem to correspond, especially as it reminded one directly of the more cheerful national life. Now Hebrew poetry finds its province and development especially in the religious field, in the service of Jehovah, and rhyme received from hence no cultivation, yea it gradually disappeared from secular poetry, since the latter became more closely connected with the developed form of the religious poetry.

The rhyme of the Hebrew national poetry[1] consequently stands on a lower stage; sometimes it resembles the modern; at others, it is only a repetition of like jingling sounds. Hence is always seen a certain tendency towards a musical euphony in the verses. We find the rhyme in the proper national songs or the prophetic sayings of early times, or in the epigrammatic maxims, which coming through the lips of the people to the time of the writer or collector, are perhaps no longer contained in their original form. Rhymed is that little song, accompanied by a dance, with which the Israelitish women went out to meet Saul and David after the victory over Goliath, 1 Sam. 18: 7,

הִכָּה שָׁאוּל בַּאֲלָפָיו
וְדָוִד בְּרִבְבֹתָיו׃

Of a like kind is that derisive exclamation of Samson on the Philistines, who had guessed his riddle, Judges 14: 18,

לוּלֵי חֲרַשְׁתֶּם בְּעֶגְלָתִי
לֹא מְצָאתֶם חִידָתִי׃

This reply is in verse, as well as the riddle itself with which it is connected, Judges 14: 14, and the solution is expressed rhythmically, though not in rhyme. The first is:

מֵהָאֹכֵל יָצָא מַאֲכָל
וּמֵעַז יָצָא מָתוֹק׃

The solution:

מָה מָתוֹק מִדְּבַשׁ
וּמֶה עַז מֵאֲרִי׃

[1] It has fared somewhat like the rhyme of the Roman national poetry, of which traces can be shown, Näke de Alliteratione Serm. Lat. in Rhein. Mus. f. Phil, 1829, p. 388. On rhyme in the Roman national poetry, see Lange, in Jahn's Jahrb. 1830, I. 3. p. 256. Kahlert de Homoeoteleuti natura et indole, 1836, p. 19 sq. Generally we find rhyme more or less developed, but almost uniformly where there is a proper national poetry, in the Arabic, Romance languages, in German, Celtic, etc., and it is commonly the mark of the popularity of the poems.

Here is found, instead of the rhyme, a striking repetition of a like-sounding initial syllable—an alliteration with the sound of M. The rhythm clearly appears provided the half-vowels are correctly pronounced.

The sacrifice-song of the Philistine lords in the temple of Dagon, Judges 16: 23, has a national tone, and is accordingly rhymed:

נָתַן אֱלֹהֵינוּ בְיָדֵנוּ
אֵת שִׁמְשׁוֹן אוֹיְבֵנוּ׃

Also the song of the people themselves, v. 24,

נָתַן אֱלֹהֵינוּ בְיָדֵנוּ אֶת אוֹיְבֵנוּ
וְאֵת מַחֲרִיב אַרְצֵנוּ
וַאֲשֶׁר חִרְבָּה אֶת חֲלָלֵינוּ׃

That sentence used in the daily breaking up of the camp, in the march through the desert, is likewise in rhyme, Num. 10: 35,

קוּמָה יְהוָה וְיָפֻצוּ אֹיְבֶיךָ
וְיָנֻסוּ מְשַׂנְאֶיךָ מִפָּנֶיךָ׃

Also Lamech's song, Gen. 4: 23, 24,

עָדָה וְצִלָּה שְׁמַעַן קוֹלִי
נְשֵׁי לֶמֶךְ הַאְזֵנָּה אִמְרָתִי
כִּי אִישׁ הָרַגְתִּי לְפִצְעִי
וְיֶלֶד לְחַבֻּרָתִי
כִּי שִׁבְעָתַיִם יֻקַּם קָיִן
וְלֶמֶךְ שִׁבְעִים וְשִׁבְעָה׃

At the end of the first two parallelisms the i-sound appears prominently; the two last lines have another kind of correspondence in sound shībâthăim yŭkkăm kâin—shibim shībâ. Also the prophetic saying on the new-born Noah, Gen. 5: 29,

זֶה יְנַחֲמֵנוּ מִמַּעֲשֵׂנוּ
וּמֵעִצְּבוֹן יָדֵינוּ
מִן הָאֲדָמָה
אֲשֶׁר אֵרְרָהּ יְהוָה׃

As in the first two lines the *ênu* is repeated in *mênu, sênu, dênu*, so in the last two lines there is the double *a* sound in *dâmâ, rarâ, yavâ*. The last, properly *yave*, would here be made to correspond, probably, with the preceding by a slight modification of the sound. Such obscuring of vowel-sounds is found in almost all national poems where there is any aim at correspondence of sound; and that the Hebrews made account of this is clearly shown, among other things, by the

etymology of proper names; e. g. גַּלְעֵד and גִּלְעָד are placed directly after each other. So the song of the well, Num. 21: 18,

עֲלִי בְאֵר עֱנוּ לָהּ
בְּאֵר חָפָרוּהָ שָׂרִים
כָּרוּהָ נְדִיבֵי הָעָם
בְּמְחֹקֵק בְּמִשְׁעֲנֹתָם׃

The two last lines are rhymed, and the sound of the last word of the first line returns in the second word of the second line and in the first of the third.

As has been before mentioned, the rhyme often appears in proverbs, which, for the most part, proceed from the living expression and the lips of the people. Thus Prov. 22: 10,

גָּרֵשׁ לֵץ וְיֵצֵא מָדוֹן
וְיִשְׁבֹּת דִּין וְקָלוֹן׃

See also Prov. 23: 22. 12: 25. 24: 28, 29. 25: 17. The consonance and rhyme in these passages is hardly accidental. They belong to the old national poetry, and here the rhyme seems to have had its authorized place.

The case is different with the rhymes, rarely occurring, in poems of a higher style. Here they may have come in unnoticed, and bear as little marks of design, as those hexameters in the prose of Livy and Tacitus, which commentators are accustomed to mark. Such are Ex. 15: 2. Deut. 32: 1, 2. 6. Ps. 119: 169. 170, Ps. 2: 3. 3: 2. 6: 2. 8: 5, etc.

There are passages where we are doubtful how the similar sound of the final syllables is to be viewed. E. g. the rhyme in Is. 60: 19, cannot be wholly accidental, for it seems too artificial:

לֹא יִהְיֶה לָּךְ עוֹד הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ לְאוֹר יוֹמָם
וּלְנֹגַהּ הַיָּרֵחַ לֹא יָאִיר לָךְ וְהָיָה לָךְ יְהוָה לְאוֹר עוֹלָם
וֵאלֹהַיִךְ לְתִפְאַרְתֵּךְ׃

See also Job 10: 9—18. Obviously designed is the correspondence in sound in Job 16: 12, and in that lies half of the emphasis:

שַׁלְוִ הָרִיתִי וַיְפָרְפְּרֵנִי
וְאָחַז בְּעָרְפִּי וַיְנַפְּצֵנִי

Manifestly for this object the similar position of the sentences was chosen, together with the unusual verbal forms.

In the popular addresses of the prophets, the rhyme appears not seldom. They let it pass, where it occasionally presented itself, with-

out either seeking it or avoiding it, e. g. Is. 1: 9, 12, 24, 25, 29. 5: 2, 14. 8: 7, 12, 13. 10: 5, 6, 11. 11: 5, 7, etc.

But of higher importance than this correspondence in sound in the final syllables—which was easily attained when sought,—is that striking and ingenious device, similar to like-sounding epithets, designed to promote the unity of thought. E. g. Amos 5: 5, הַגִּלְגָּל גָּלֹה יִגְלֶה וּבֵית אֶל יִהְיֶה לָאָוֶן; Is. 21: 2, עֲלִי עֵילָם; Zeph. 2: 4, עַזָּה עֲזוּבָה; Jer. 6: 1, בְּתְקוֹעַ תִּקְעוּ שׁוֹפָר; Is. 41: 5, comp. Zach. 9: 5, רָאוּ יִרְאוּ. We linger no longer here, since this preference for like-sounding and piquant expressions is connected with the prophetic style, and though popular, does not belong to poetry properly so called.[1]

Explanation of the word סֶלָה, Selah.

General Observations.

This word has been subjected to a great variety of interpretations. In some places it should seem to be a designation of time; in others to be closely connected with the context; in some it stands independently; again it seems to mark the conclusion of a strophe; or it is a musical term of unknown meaning; or it signifies a pause, where the voices cease and the instruments begin. Suitable means to ascertain the signification of the word are almost wholly wanting. Tradition is opposed to tradition and one testimony is at variance with another. The subject, though difficult, is still not without value. A brief examination may throw light on other important questions.

Jewish Tradition.

The Targums and the later commentators upon them give to the word the meaning *eternally, forever.* The Targum of Jonathan everywhere assigns it that sense, commonly placing for it, לְעַלְמָא or לְעָלְמִין. Even in Hab. 3: 3, it is made to mean "*by his eternal power*, he covered the heavens with his glory." With this agrees not only the Targum of Joseph the Blind, but the other ancient Jewish remains written in Aramaean. The Talmud (Erubim ch. 5, p. 54) makes the three words נֶצַח סֶלָה וָעֶד synonymous. Aquila renders it *ἀεί*, which Jerome follows in agreement with his Rabbinic teachers. Theodotion and Symmachus waver, not knowing whom to follow. The former in Habakkuk writes *εἰς τέλος*, the latter *εἰς τόν αἰῶνα*; in the Psalms, with the Seventy, both write *διάψαλμα.* A similar variation is found

[1] Knobel in his Prophetismus I. p. 406 sq., has collected these paronomasia.

in the Syriac versions, though *διάψαλμα* is probably a later interpretation. Selah with the meaning of לְעוֹלָם was early employed in the liturgies, and being a euphonous closing word was placed once or more after the amen. It is hardly necessary to say that this meaning is untenable. In some places it is opposed to the sense, in others it is superfluous. E. g. Ps. 77: 16, "Thou hast redeemed thy people with a strong arm, the sons of Jacob and Joseph. Selah" = eternally! Ps. 89: 5, "from generation to generation thy throne. Selah" = eternally! Aben Ezra, while he rejects this signification, explains the word as synonymous with *amen*, not remembering that the two significations are originally so closely connected, that one must fall with the other, for the current use of Selah as *amen* rests on its being equivalent to לָנֶצַח. Most of the Rabbinic commentators remain true to the traditional interpretation. Kimchi, however, rejects it, and explains the word as a mark or sign to elevate the voice. In his Lexicon he adduces as a proof that the word is a musical sign, that it is found only in the Psalms and Habakkuk which were sung. This opinion found much currency especially in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Hellenistic Interpretations.

The Seventy uniformly translate Selah by *διάψαλμα*. But it is not a little remarkable that ancient writers do not give us the exact meaning of this word. Origen and Athanasius afford no help. Gregory of Caesarea assigns to it a mystical sense = a temporary cessation of the influence of the Holy Spirit on the singing choir! Chrysostom regards it as only one among manifold opinions, that *diapsalma* designates merely the alternation of different choirs or choruses in the performance of a psalm. Jerome prefers the meaning *semper*. Augustine remarks that it is doubtful whether it is of Hebrew or Greek origin. All these are obviously only conjectures. If the word had not been wholly foreign to the Greek writers, there would have been a much more definite opinion in regard to its meaning. We may inquire why *διάψαλμα* should mean, as many suppose, a *change* an *alternation*. The reason is probably this: From its position it would seem to be a notification or note. The verbal import of it might lead to the further supposition that it was musical or rhythmical. As it occurs several times in the middle of a poem, it might seem to refer to the introduction of something new, or an alternation in the music, according to analogies in Greek poetry. There is, e. g. the *νόμος τριμελής*, where there was a three-fold change, the first being sung after a Dorian measure, the second after a Phrygian, the third after

a Lydian. Thus it might be thought that *διάψαλμα* must be referred to something similar, i. e. it must be a mark for the introduction of a new mode or measure in a poem. Had the Alexandrian translators understood by the word an *ἐναλλαγὴ μέλους*, they would either have used this current expression or *μεταβολή*. Still they employ *διάψαλμα* without reference to the words just named.

Recent Explanations of the Word.

The number of opinions in later times has been very great and discordant. Some supposed that it served only to complete a metrical verse, and had no significance itself; others that it was a name of God, *excelsus*, from סָלַל *exaltare;* or that it originated at a time when the Psalter was not divided, and that it is a mark for the beginning of a new reading lesson; or that it is the Imp. Kal from סָלָא, *be propitious*, etc. Reime and others imagined it to be an abbreviation of a liturgical formula and to mean *condona nobis vel mihi, Deus.* But antiquity knew nothing of these Rabbinical abbreviations.

Herder explains Selah as indicating a change of tone, which is expressed either by increase of force or by a transition into another time and mode.[1] This is a repetition of the meaning of Selah as *διαλλαγὴ μέλους ἢ ῥυθμοῦ*, only not well expressed. What we call *time* did not exist in ancient music, so that we cannot speak of changes of time but only of a change of rhythm. So also with the change of key, for it is a groundless supposition that the Hebrews had various keys, though there might have been a change in the selection of the music or melody. Against Herder's theory it may be said that Selah occurs not only in connection with the strophic and other larger divisions, but also in the middle of a verse, where there can be no pause, but only a quiet progression in the thought. It is also not seldom found at the conclusion of a psalm, where consequently the representation is at an end. Mattheson[2] explains the word as meaning a repetition or a return, i. e. it is an indication that the melody should be repeated either by instruments or another choir. But supposing that the Hebrews were acquainted with this musical repetition—which is improbable—the word occurs in the midst of sentences, between the Protasis and Apodosis, yea even after the first words of a psalm, where a repetition would be absolutely inadmissible. Forkel[3] would make it indicate a change of time or a repetition of the same melody in higher or

[1] Spirit of Hebrew Poetry, II. p. 267, Marsh's Trans.

[2] Erläutertes Sela.

[3] Geschichte d. Musik I. p. 144.

deeper tones, or an alternation of the singing choir or instrumental choir—an opinion which has been above refuted.

It has been thought by some that the matter could be set in a clear light by considering the etymology of the word as from סלה. Still, it is not absolutely certain from which of possible roots it comes. Gesenius derives it from סלה = שלה *quievit, siluit*, Imp. Kal properly סְלֵה, with ה Paragog. סְלָה, in Pause, סֶלָה, and as Jussive Imp. with the meaning, *silence!* This view was adopted by Luther, Pfeiffer and others. It is at present the current meaning of the word, adopted by De Wette in his Translation of the Bible, and in his Commentary on the Psalms. Selah would thus denote that the song ceases and the instrumental part begins. This view certainly might be admitted, if we met with the word only in places like the following: Ps. 39: 5, 11, 66: 4, 7, 15. 76: 3, 10. 77: 3, 9. 81: 7. 83: 8. 84: 8. 89: 37, 45, 48. 140: 3, 5, 8. 143: 6, where the word manifestly stands in connection with the sections and transition-points of the psalms. On the contrary, the pause of the singers and an interlude are inexplicable, contrary to the sense even, in passages where the Selah is placed in the midst of sentences which are very closely connected, e. g. Ps. 55: 19. 68: 7, 32. 85: 2. 87: 6. 88: 7. Hab. 3: 3, 9, and elsewhere. In the two last cases, the word is placed in the midst of the verse. It is also found at the conclusion of a Psalm, e. g. 3, 9, 24, 46, where the note *silence!* would have no meaning, for the performance is at an end, and the ceasing of the singers would be self-evident. But supposing that an instrumental after-piece were to follow the vocal part, it is inconceivable how this should be designated by the words, *Be silent!* The singers, after they had completed their performance, were still categorically commanded, that they should close their lips! At all events it would be superfluous. And then to call out to those prepared to play an interlude, *silence!* to annex a command where there is a proper limit of itself, is a supposition hardly conceivable.

On הִגָּיוֹן סֶלָה Ps. 9: 17, Gesenius thus expresses himself: "Which by apposition may be rendered, instrumental music, pause, i. e. let the instruments play, and the singer stop." So Maurer: "fidium cantus, pausa," De Wette, "harping, pause," also Hitzig and the great majority of interpreters. But is it probable that such a direction as *silence! pause!* would have been expressed by music? In that case the words would have been reversed, for according to the supposition, the music should follow the ceasing of the vocal part. Besides, this interpretation is at variance with the accents, for a Tiphha is found under הִגָּיוֹן, while סֶלָה is by the Masorites closely connected by a Merka. Ewald, in the explanation of the word, begins

with Ps. 9: 16, where he supposes the phrase is found in full. The first of the two words means *skilful playing*, music, especially instrumental music. The other word, סֶלָה, he derives from the substantive סל, whose root סָלַל = *to rise, to ascend*, whence סֻלָּם *scala*, which word is likewise used in a musical sense. Accordingly סֶלָה means *up*, *upwards*, which in matters of sound is equivalent to *loud*, *clear*, and הַגָּיוֹן סֶלָה = *the music loud*, i. e. let the vocal cease while the instrumental alone is heard. But this explanation has its difficulties. It must appear strange that in abbreviating the phrase, the most important word is omitted, while the almost superfluous word סֶלָה *upwards*, remains. Especially is הִגָּיוֹן the appropriate word to express the sounding of stringed instruments, and the meaning is fully reached in denoting the powerful or exclusive bringing out of the instruments. Besides, as already shown, such an interlude would violently separate sentences that are closely connected.

Two more opinions only will be adverted to. Prof. Köster,[1] leaving the relations of this note or mark to the psalmody undetermined, finds in it a strophe-divider, it being a special mark of the strophic division of the Psalms. The strophes of Köster, however, are a matter of uncertainty, and when these escape from our grasp, the Selah also loses its significance. Still, we would not deny that a correct, though not a complete idea, lies at the basis of Köster's view. De Wette, also, in the last editions of his Commentary on the Psalms, has called attention to the *strophic* meaning of Selah. Without looking here more closely at the prosodical position of Selah, we will remark, in passing, only this, that Selah is certainly found in many places at the conclusion of actual strophes. Still, it is readily seen, that if it were a proper strophe-divider, it would be found far oftener than it is in reality. In a great number of psalms, where the structure is undoubtedly strophic, it does not appear at all, and in poems where it is found, it does not throughout denote the strophes. But as a decisive objection, it must be stated that the word is found not only at the end but in the middle of strophes, Hab. 3: 3, 9. Ps. 55: 20. How could Selah in such cases serve as a divider of strophes?

Prof. Wocher,[2] also, starts from a correct point of view, viz. that סֶלָה is the expression of a very strong, earnest feeling, for all the passages where it is found are remarkable for strength and loftiness of emotion. The Psalms which contain סֶלָה were triumphal songs, ardent thanksgivings, jubilant hymns of praise, the overflowings of grief and despair, of longing desire and trust; and סֶלָה is certainly found at

[1] Stud. u. Krit. 1831, p. 54.

[2] Tübingen Theol. Quartalschrift, 1834, p. 631.

such points in the hymn as concentrate the impression, or seize upon a great thought of the soul; thus it is found with names full of significance, e. g. Jacob, Joseph. According to this view, סֶלָה is the appeal or summons of the singer himself, who, with this word, expresses the most fervent feeling, and it belongs essentially to the text. Wocher derives it from סלח or סלל *to extol, to esteem, to weigh*, equivalent to *up! up, my soul!* sursum corda, or if from סלל, *value and ponder the word.* But if Selah is a mere animating call of an excited singer to those around him, then it is surprising that in many Psalms it is not found at all, which in respect to lyrical elevation and emotion are not at all inferior to those where it is found. Why is it wholly wanting in the songs inserted in the historical books? Why do not the prophets use it, whose words so often rise to the highest pitch of emotion, and which emphatically claim the sympathy of their hearers. But in the prophets it never appears, except twice in Habakkuk, where, as in the Psalms, the poetry is liturgical. It is not found in certain sections of the Psalms, e. g. in the long series, Ps. 90—139, 144—150. And if the word belongs to the text so essentially, why does it never occur in the context, but always apart from it?

Masoretic Text.

The Masorites joined סֶלָה immediately with the context of the verse with which it stands, just as was the case with the traditional interpretation of the Rabbins and the Targums. In their exegetical commentary—the punctuation-system,—we see the usual Aramaean-Jewish idea. How could the Masorites have known otherwise, as the learned men and Targumists of preceding times had determined the meaning? Or how could a better explanation which the Masorites might have had of the word have passed away in after time without a trace? No, it appears, incontrovertibly, from the Masoretic union-marks that they, like their predecessors and followers, understood the word as equivalent to לָנֶצַח, *forever.* Comp. Ps. 82: 2, where Selah is connected in the closest manner with the verb, and made to correspond to עַד־מָתַי, "will ye *always* accept the person of the wicked?" So the Targum, לְצַלְמִין. See a like correspondence between the Masorites and the Targum in Ps. 62: 4. 3: 4, 9. 4: 4. 9: 16. Hab. 3: 9. In conformity with this explanation, סֶלָה is everywhere drawn into the context by the Masorites, and in most cases closely connected with the preceding word by a conjunctive accent. In the seventy-four places where Selah is found, the preceding word is connected with Selah in fifty-seven instances by Munahh, in three by Munahh superius,

in nine by Merka, in two by Maqqeph. With such a punctuation, no other interpretation than the one above given is possible. In the other three places a distinctive accent stands before סֶלָה, yet the passages are of such a nature, that they do not form an exception to the above interpretation; e. g. Hab. 3: 3, a distinctive accent with the previous word was necessary; "Paran from eternity or forever," would have made no sense. So in Hab. 3: 13. In the other case, Ps. 55: 20, Selah in the sense of *forever* would be a mere tautology. Thus it is perfectly manifest that the Masorites followed no other interpretation in their punctuation than the common one of the Rabbins, which is undeniably false. The punctuation in such a case is without any binding authority. The Masorites pointed the word סֶלָה, perhaps in reference to נֶצַח, with which they supposed it corresponded in meaning, the punctuation being of like value with that to the musical superscriptions to the Psalms, which the Masorites understood no better than we do at the present day. What one does not understand, he cannot correctly point. The vocalization of the Masorites then affords no starting-point, from which, looking at the language, we can resolve the sense of the term. Setting the language aside, we must consider the thing itself.

Views of Sommer.

Since the meaning of all the passages where סֶלָה is found can be fully expressed without that word, its omission not impairing the thought, and since, on the other hand, no one of all the interpretations, if we connect the word with the context, as the Masorites have done, can be made out in all the passages, something superfluous being always appended to the verse, then it follows that סֶלָה does not properly belong to the context, but must stand independently, and is consequently an inserted or intercalary note. But this note is found only in poems, and only in such as were temple-songs, and which, for the most part, are still provided with musical notes, i. e. in psalms and in the lyrical ode of Habakkuk, which was designed for musical representation, and which is a psalm, both in contents and in prosodical form.

The contents of the passages where סֶלָה is found are certainly manifold; still it may be observed in general that it never stands with words that are of little importance, but always in connection with such as contain matters of moment for the theocracy, or as express a great religious sentiment. Here belong the references to the divine promises, which are represented either as fulfilled with thankful emo-

tion, or with the expression of complaint as still unfulfilled; experiences of deliverances drawn from the life of the poet or from the history of the people; fervent appeals to the majesty and righteousness of God, to protect and bless the pious, and to inflict punishment on the wicked; deep sorrow on account of being forsaken by the God of salvation; longing for union with Him, etc. In short it is the main points in the religious consciousness of the Israelites which appear to be marked in those poems that contain Selah. The energy of feeling that predominates in such passages would correspond perfectly to a spirited, sonorous music, and סֶלָה accordingly has an essentially religious aim. Thus from many passages, the more definite design of this religious music is easily seen, namely, to impart, in an audible form, to the words with which the music was sung, full force of expression, in order to make it manifest that these words would reach the ear of the Almighty, and be answered. For this object there existed among the Hebrews, as among other ancient nations, a peculiar, musical rite, which had its place in connection with offerings, and thence was transferred to the psalmody. Thereby we approximate somewhat to the understanding of this dark term, סֶלָה, for the words with which it stands are certainly such as before all others would come up in remembrance before Jehovah.

In order to confirm this view, it will be necessary to examine all the passages where סֶלָה is found.

Ps. 20 is an inauguration hymn in behalf of a warlike undertaking of a king of Israel, for which, with the promise of rich offerings, the help of Jehovah is claimed. In this psalm Selah occurs only once, v. 3: "May he send thee help from the sanctuary and sustain thee out of Zion! May he remember all thy gifts, and thy burnt-offerings accept! Selah." This position of Selah in connection with the reason why help against the foe is sought, viz. in connection with the reference to the rich offerings of the king, which might be graciously remembered by Jehovah, reminds us naturally of that Mosaic ordinance, Num. 10: 9, 10, "And if ye go to war in your land against the enemy that oppresseth you, then ye shall blow an alarm with the trumpets; and ye shall be remembered before the Lord your God, and ye shall be saved from your enemies. Also * * * ye shall blow with the trumpets over your burnt-offerings, and over the sacrifices of your peace-offerings, that they may be to you for a memorial before God." Since now the trumpets designed for such symbolic music, were also associated with psalmody, it was certainly fitting that the trumpets should be introduced at those words in the sacrifice hymns which were particularly designed to reach the ear of Jehovah and

claim his help, so that the requests connected with the sacrifices and the prayers might come into remembrance before him. There the main point was indicated. God would remember the piety of the king on which the prayer for divine aid was based. In Ps. 21, probably composed in reference to the same undertaking, but after its happy termination, and sung in connection with the thank-offering, Selah is found but once. As its position in Ps. 20 is in proximity with the prayer, so here it is connected with the thanksgiving: v. 3, "O Jehovah, in thy strength the king shall rejoice, and in thy salvation, how greatly shall he exult! The desire of his heart thou hast given him, and the request of his lips thou hast not withheld! Selah." Here the main point of the poem is marked by Selah. The rising tones would bring out the words emphatically, and bear them upwards to Jehovah's ear. In another psalm likewise composed and sung in connection with the sacrifice offered in the payment of vows, Ps. 66, Selah occurs in the three principal parts of the poem, first, after the introduction, which declares the praise of God; v. 4, "All the world shall pray before thee, and shall sing praises unto thee, shall praise thy name! Selah;" secondly, v. 7, which celebrates the majesty of God, "Who ruleth by his power forever, his eyes look on the nations, that the proud do not exalt themselves! Selah;" finally, v. 15, where the occasion of the poem and of the sacrifice is expressed, "I will come into thy house with burnt-offerings, I will pay my vows to thee, which my mouth has uttered in my distress. Burnt-offerings of fatlings I will offer to thee, with the incense of rams, I will offer bullocks with goats! Selah." The expressions of faith and of thankful vows addressed directly to Jehovah, are here distinguished by Selah, i. e. by the music there introduced, because they were designed to come up in remembrance before God. In a similar manner Selah occurs in Ps. 60, where the psalmist in behalf of a military expedition begun unfortunately, implores the help of Jehovah so much the more urgently as the war was undertaken from religious motives. As the last is the more important point, it is brought out by Selah, which elsewhere in this psalm does not occur, v. 4, "Thou hast given a banner to them that fear thee, that it may be displayed because of thy truth! Selah." Similar is the appeal to him, who heareth in heaven in Ps. 7: 5, "Let the enemy persecute my soul, and take it, yea let him tread down my life upon the earth, and lay mine honor in the dust! Selah." The poet marks the bold words by Selah, in order that they may be more certainly heard by God, and his own innocence recognized before him. Ps. 67: 1, "God be merciful unto us and bless us and cause his face to shine upon us! Se-

lah." The music here introduced would bring out prominently the 'blessing,' so that God might hear and bestow it.

What has been said will throw light on the use of Selah in the four passages in Ps. 89. The psalm expresses deep grief on account of the miserable state of the times, and refers to the great promises made to Israel in former ages, yet remaining unfulfilled. In the first two passages, Selah concludes the reference to Jehovah's ancient covenants of mercy; v. 3, "I have made a covenant," etc.; v. 4, "Thy seed will I establish forever, and build up thy throne to all generations! Selah;" v. 37, "It shall be established forever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven! Selah." Here Selah constitutes the great points in the hymn,—Jehovah's faithfulness to his promises. In the other two places the actual contrast to those animating views is exhibited; v. 45, "Thou hast covered him with shame! Selah;" v. 48, "Shall he deliver his soul from the hand of the grave! Selah." Here the lamentation of the psalmist on the apparent fruitlessness of those gracious promises, on the rejection of Israel and on his own life filled with sorrow, is distinguished by Selah. The poet sees death draw near, but no hope which will call forth thanks and exulting praise to the God of salvation. These complaints, together with the recollections of the ancient promises, would be made to reach the ear of the Almighty by the swelling tones of the music. In Ps. 87, is the expression of thanks for the fulfilment of the divine promises. Both the divine promises and the present condition of things are marked by Selah, "Glorious things are spoken of thee, O city of God! Selah." And of Zion it shall be said, This and that man was born in her, and the Highest himself shall establish her. The Lord shall count when he writeth up the people, that this and that man was born in her! Selah." Here is a reference to the security of Jerusalem and to her greatly increased inhabitants, as a proof of the Divine protection and blessing. So Hab. 3: 9, we are reminded of the ancient merciful deliverances, which the prophet hopes to see confirmed in a glorious manner in the approaching great afflictions: Bared is his bow; oaths of the tribes; triumphal song! Selah." As in Ps. 89, Selah occurs twice in Ps. 39, to express bitter complaint and longing to be heard. Ps. 88: 7, "Thy wrath lieth hard upon me, and thou hast afflicted me with all thy waves! Selah;" also in v. 10, and 84: 8. As in all these passages there is a direct or indirect appeal that Jehovah would remember mercy and afford help, so in Ps. 3, the word occurs at the three main points of the psalm, first in the representation of the distress, v. 2; and then in the delineation of the connection of faith with the divine help. To this loud call to Jehovah corre-

sponds the sound of the trumpet. Finally it follows, v. 8, where there is the expression of joyful confidence that Jehovah will come to help. The music introduced at this point claims that Jehovah will hear. Similar is the use of the word in Ps. 55: 8. As the music introduced with סֶלָה exhibits sorrow, complaint and prayer for deliverance, with all their claims on Jehovah for a gracious answer, the same also holds good in the expression of lively thanks which should reach the Almighty. In Ps. 32, on the topic of the forgiveness of sins, the word occurs in both relations, first, at the conclusion of the description of the psalmist's troubles in body and soul, in consequence of the anguish of his mind caused by his guilt; and then with the declaration that God had pardoned his sins; and finally, with praise for this merciful deliverance. Also Ps. 85: 2. Ps. 46: 3, 7, 11, with the expression of joyful trust and 62: 8, with reference to God's mighty acts towards Israel, Ps. 76: 3, 9. 48: 8. 77: 15. 81: 7. 68: 7. Hab. 3: 3. Ps. 47: 4. With lively thanksgiving to God, Ps. 24: 9. 44: 8. 68: 19, 32. 84: 4. In the expression of earnest desire for God, Ps. 143: 6. With these words the pious feelings of the psalmist reached their highest pitch. Comp. Ps. 61: 4, also Ps. 24: 5.

The passages remaining to be considered are where the justice or righteousness of God is handled. It is unnecessary to prove how important this matter was in view of the pious Israelites. For centuries, the worshippers of Jehovah, oppressed and abused, were harassed with almost passionate desire, hoping and expecting the immediate divine interposition. Why the word סֶלָה frequently occurs in these references to the justice of God, or in the direct appeals to that justice, is this, that in all these passages, the words expressing a cordial trust in God and a spirit of prayer, have a liturgical signification, and are designed to go up in remembrance before God. E. g. "The heavens shall make known his righteousness, for God is judge! Selah." Ps. 50: 6. So Ps. 9: 17. 67: 5. 66: 7. 75: 4. In other places belonging to this class, the punishment and destruction of the wicked and heathen are directly prayed for, Ps. 9: 21. 59: 6, 14. 140: 9. The assured faith in the justice of God, that a speedy overthrow awaits the ungodly foe, is confirmed by the word Selah, as thereby God may hear them and grant their requests, Ps. 52: 5, 7. 49: 14, 16. 55: 20. 57: 3. The position of the word in the last passage is instructive: "He shall send from heaven, and save me from the reproach of him that would swallow me up! Selah. God shall send forth his mercy and truth." The supposition of a pause, or of a proper *intermezzo*, or of a division of the strophes, or the like, is shown to be wholly untenable. As a voucher for our explanation, it can be clearly seen, for

what purpose the Selah is introduced. The psalmist, encompassed with trouble and danger, opens his poem immediately with an appeal to the divine compassion. But wicked men are the cause of all his trouble, "Whose teeth are spears and arrows and their tongues a sharp sword," and they are in like manner Jehovah's calumniators and blasphemers. On this latter point he founds his hope that he shall be delivered from them through Jehovah's aid. Consequently in the midst of the sentence he interposes the remark, "whom my enemies reproach," and distinguishes it with the note סֶלָה —(the intercessory, ritual music here falling in)—because the character of his enemies as those who disown God, is now fully brought into remembrance before Jehovah. In like manner, v. 7. Hab. 3: 13. Ps. 54: 5. 62: 5. 82: 2. In Ps. 4: 3, 5, both passages are accompanied by a symbolical appeal to God, that he would hear and help. See also Ps. 83: 9. 140: 4, 6.

We have now considered the seventy-four passages in which סֶלָה is found, and we cannot hesitate to recognize in them an actual appeal or summons to Jehovah. They are calls for aid and prayers to be heard, expressed either with entire directness, or if not in the imperative, "Hear Jehovah! or awake Jehovah!" and the like, yet still, in their connection, manifest addresses to God, that he would remember and hear the earnest expression of thanks, or the heartfelt convictions, desires and hopes of the psalmist.

A word in regard to the nature of the music indicated in connection with סֶלָה. In the Hebrew ritual there were peculiar musical instruments for the symbolical representation of an urgent appeal to Jehovah. These were the trumpets, חֲצֹצְרוֹת, which Moses introduced into the worship of God, and in Num. 10: 10, directed that they should be blown in connection with the sacrifices, so that they might be for a memorial for the offerers, זִכָּרוֹן, before their God. This instrument was used for the same object on the first day of the month in which that great act of God's mercy, the yearly atonement for Israel's sins was expected. This day was distinguished from the fact that the trumpets were blown in order that they might be a memorial before God. This is called, Lev. 23: 24, "a memorial of blowing of trumpets." The trumpets were also blown when the people went to war, "so that they might be remembered before the Lord their God, and be saved from their enemies," Num. 10: 9. 2 Chron. 13: 14. And they were used on other occasions as a symbolical accompaniment to an earnest cry to God for help, or to remind him of his mercy. Thus Judas Maccabaeus and his army, 1 Mac. 4: 40, when they found the

sanctuary wasted and burnt, "rent their clothes, fell on the ground, and blew with the sounding trumpets, and cried to heaven."

If we can determine the object of these priestly trumpets, then we shall see with what design they were connected with psalmody. When the sacrifice-service received through David those essential additions which in consequence associated language with the mere symbolical expression of religious ideas and sentiments as the most spiritual and definite expression of the same, then the words, introduced into the symbolical ritual as a new form of it, were not themselves entirely deprived of a symbolical significance, but were enriched with a musical, symbolical accompaniment. The trumpets of the priests were connected with the Levitical psalmody, and that they had not a *mere* musical significance is apparent from the fact that they did not fall into the hands of the Levitical musicians, but, separated from them, remained with the priests. Wherever those who performed the psalmody are introduced, the priests with the trumpets are mentioned, along with the Levites, but always distinct from them, 1 Chron. 15: 18—24. 16: 4—6. 2 Chron. 5: 12. 29: 26—28. Ezra 3: 10. Neh. 12: 35, 36; and these two musical choirs, different in nature, remain separate in the performance of the psalm. The Levites stood in the singers' gallery, opposite to the priests with trumpets, 2 Chron. 7: 6. The instruments of the Levites served to praise and thank Jehovah; those of the priests for intercession. The musical character of this instrument was besides only of a subordinate kind. Though scarcely anything is stated in the Old Testament on the uses of the trumpet in the Levitical psalmody, yet a reference to the relations under which it appears, may guide us to probable conjectures. First, it was not at all analogous to the modern instrumental music as connected with the general harmony of a piece, nor to the present relation of wind instruments to stringed instruments and to the vocal part. The ancient trumpet was not adapted to melody, and the various performance with it consisted only in bringing out its tones either single or continuous, or in a more rapid interchange or alternating quantity, like our peals. In this was comprised the difference between תָּקַע בַּחֲצֹצְרָה *to blow with the trumpets*, and הֵרִיעַ בַּחֲצֹצְרָה *to blow an alarm with the trumpets*, Num. 10: 8, 9. The trumpet could not have been in any way an appropriate instrumental accompaniment for the ancient singing, which relied especially on a clear understanding of the words of the poem. Still, when we find it associated with the psalmody, its only office was to fall in at certain points, namely, those where intercession was expressed, or, in accordance with the words of the text, to indicate an appeal to Jehovah or to support it in a liturgical form. Occasion for

this must have been so much the more frequent, as the "Lord's song" in ancient times was not designed, as was the case in later periods, to express the national feelings and necessities, or general ascriptions of praise to God; its contents were entirely of an individual character, so that the poet-musicians uttered, and called upon God to hear, their most characteristic sentiments and experiences, their personal sufferings and complaints, their thanksgivings and manifold petitions. Now if we suppose that the significant tones of the trumpet fell in with and marked the words where the psalmist would present before God the leading desires of his heart, his most ardent hopes and convictions and assure himself of being heard, then certainly these are the points or passages where we should find סֶלָה subjoined. Here therefore is seen the office or use of the trumpets, and here Selah also appears. It is placed by the poet at the passages, where in the temple-song, the choir of priests, standing opposite to that of the Levites, sounded the trumpets (סלל), and, with the powerful tones of this instrument, the words just spoken were marked and borne upwards to Jehovah's ear. This intercessory music of the priests was probably sustained on the part of the Levites by the vigorous tones of the psaltery and harp; hence the Greek term *διάψαλμα*. The same appears further from the full phrase הִגָּיוֹן סֶלָה, Ps. 9: 16, the first word denoting the sound of the stringed instruments, Ps. 92: 3; the latter, the blast of the trumpets, both of which would here sound together. The less important word, הִגָּיוֹן, disappeared when the expression was abbreviated, and סֶלָה alone remained.

Thus the main inquiry, What is the meaning of Selah, is answered.

ARTICLE IV.

NOTES ON BIBLICAL GEOGRAPHY.

By E. Robinson, D. D., Professor at New York.

I. Abila of Lysanias. The Inscriptions.

The Evangelist Luke relates, that John the Baptist entered upon his public ministry "in the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar; Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea, and Herod [Antipas] being tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip tetrarch of Iturea and of the region of Trachonitis, and Lysanias the tetrarch of Abilene;" Luke

3: 1. It might here seem, that the writer was intending to mark the state of the governments in the several provinces and regions where John and Jesus were about to exercise their ministry. Judea and Galilee were the chief scenes of our Lord's labors; but he traversed also the dominions of Philip (which included Gaulonitis) where he passed from the eastern shore of the Lake of Tiberias to Caesarea Philippi; Mark 8: 13, 22—27. But why is Abilene likewise mentioned? Very possibly because, as we shall see, it lay upon the northern confines of Philip's territories, stretching along the eastern slope of Hermon and Anti-Lebanon; so that our Lord, while in the neighborhood of Caesarea Philippi, may very easily have entered and preached within its limits. Indeed, according to a passage from Josephus hereafter to be quoted (Antt. 15. 10. 3), it is not improbable that the district of Paneas (Caesarea Philippi) itself may have been at that time connected with Abilene under the rule of Lysanias.

The district Abilene was so called from its chief town Abila; known also as *Abila of Lysanias*, to distinguish it from another Abila in Peraea (now Abil), situated between Gadara and Capitolias; see Polyb. 5. 71. 2. Jos. B. J. 2. 13. 2. ib. 4. 7. 5. The Abila of Lysanias is marked by the geographer Ptolemy and the Itineraries as lying between Heliopolis (Báalbek) and Damascus, on the eastern slope of Anti-Lebanon. This of course decides the general position of the district Abilene. The definite site of Abila we shall endeavor to ascertain further on.

The eastern declivity of Anti-Lebanon is quite gradual; or, rather, this eastern side is characterized by successive lower ridges, with intervening open tracts or terraces, running parallel with its course, and presenting towards the east steep declivities and sometimes perpendicular precipices. The river Barada, the ancient Chrysorrhoas, the only important stream of Anti-Lebanon, rises high up in the mountain and flows by Damascus. In its course it breaks through no less than three such ridges;—one below Zebedâny; a second near el-Fîjeh; and a third at Dummar.[1] There are many villages along this stream, which are now comprised in the modern district of Zebedâny. Others are more thinly scattered along the slope further south, and on the side of Jebel esh-Sheikh; after which succeeds the district of Bellân reaching to Bâniâs. These tracts would seem to have constituted the ancient tetrarchy of Abilene; bounded south by Gaulonitis; east by the territory or plain of Damascus; and north by the more desert parts of Anti-Lebanon.

Syria under the Romans and during the times of the New Testa-

[1] Manuscr. Journ. of Rev. E. Smith.

ment, constituted an *imperial* province, subject to the direct control of the emperor; and was governed by a legate of his appointment with the title of pro-consul or pro-praetor.[1] But in Syria, along with this general pro-consular authority extending in a certain degree over the whole, the emperor not unfrequently bestowed particular districts upon individuals, with the title of king, tetrarch, or the like; who thus held them as fiefs, and were dependent only on the emperor himself, and not upon the pro-consul; except as the latter chose or strove to exert an influence over them.[2] Such was the kingdom of Herod the Great, comprising Palestine and Idumea; and such, after his decease, were the tetrarchies of his sons Herod Antipas and Philip mentioned by Luke; Judea meantime being governed by a Roman pro-curator under the authority of the Syrian pro-consul. These fiefs were given out freely by the emperors to their favorites; and especially to the later Herods and Agrippas, the descendants of Herod the Great. Such a fief too, apparently, was the Abilene of Lysanias.

Two persons bearing the name of Lysanias are known in history in connection with Abilene; the first of whom only is mentioned by Josephus. His father was Ptolemy the son of Mennaeus, who in the time of Pompey was lord of Chalcis (*δυναστεύων Χαλχίδος*) under Mount Lebanon; and he is likewise spoken of as a powerful and dangerous neighbor to Damascus; from which latter circumstance it may perhaps be inferred that his dominion extended also over Abilene quite to the territory of Damascus; Jos. Antt. 14. 7. 4; comp. 13. 16. 3 and 14. 3. 2. He was succeeded by his son Lysanias about B. C. 40; Antt. 14. 13. 3. B. J. 1. 13. 1. But that this Lysanias had anything to do with Abilene, is nowhere affirmed; it may however be inferred as in the case of his father; and has usually been assumed on the strength of a notice more than half a century later, referring to Abilene as "the tetrarchy of Lysanias;" Antt. 19. 5. 1. ib. 20. 7. 1; comp. 18. 6. 10. B. J. 2. 11. 5. Through the intrigues of Cleopatra, Lysanias was put to death by Antony about B. C. 34; and a portion (*πολλά*) of his domains was given over for a time to that princess; Antt. 15. 4. 1. Dio Cass. 49. 32. Some years afterwards we find mention of a certain Zenodorus as having *farmed* the possessions (*οἶκος*) of Lysanias; Antt. 15. 10. 1. B. J. 1. 20. 4. The same person held jurisdiction over Trachonitis, Auranitis and Batanea, as also over other smaller districts west of these; but having become implicated with robber-hordes in Trachonitis and elsewhere, Augustus about B. C. 22 took from him those three districts, and gave them in charge to

[1] Adam's Rom. Antt. p. 165, 166.

[2] See one instance of this in Jos. Antt. 19. 8. 1.

Herod the Great, in order that he might extirpate the robbers; Antt. 15. 10. 1. A few years later, on the death of Zenodorus at Antioch, B. C. 19, Herod further received a large portion (*μοῖραν οὐκ ὀλίγην*) of his remaining territories, viz. Ulatha, Paneas, and the region round about; Antt. 15. 10. 3. B. J. 1. 20. 4. Among the districts thus acquired by Herod the Great, there is however no mention nor suggestion of Abilene; though we may infer that Paneas had been connected with it.

There is no further historical notice, which can be regarded as in any way relating to Abilene, until nearly fifty years later in the fifteenth year of Tiberius; when, as Luke informs us, "Lysanias was the tetrarch of Abilene." This was nearly sixty-five years after the murder of the former Lysanias, the only one named by Josephus. This notice of Luke is in fact the earliest mention extant of Abilene; nor does Josephus speak of it as a tetrarchy or as belonging to Lysanias, until ten years afterwards. He then informs us that the emperor Caligula, in the first year of his reign (A. D. 38), gave to the elder Agrippa, the Herod of the book of Acts, the territory of his uncle Philip, and added likewise Abilene under the name of the tetrarchy of Lysanias; Antt. 18. 6. 10; comp. B. J. 2. 9. 6. These were confirmed to Agrippa by the succeeding emperor Claudius, on his accession in A. D. 41; who bestowed upon him also those parts of Judea and Samaria which had belonged to his grandfather Herod the Great. These last, the historian remarks, were granted to him as having upon them a sort of family claim; but the emperor gave him likewise "Abilene and all upon Mount Lebanon," as districts *belonging to himself* (*ἐκ τῶν αὐτοῦ προσετίθετο*); Antt. 19. 5. 1. B. J. 2. 11. 5. After the miserable death of Herod Agrippa at Caesarea (Acts 12: 21—23. Antt. 19. 8. 2), Claudius in the thirteenth year of his reign granted to the younger Agrippa, the son of Herod Agrippa, that portion of his father's territories comprised in the former tetrarchy of Philip, and Abilene the tetrarchy of Lysanias; but took from him Chalcis, which he had held four years; Antt. 20. 7. 1; comp. B. J. 2. 12. 1. This is the latest historical notice we have of the district Abilene.

It thus appears, that Josephus nowhere speaks of Abilene in connection with the first Lysanias; nor indeed does he mention it at all, until ten years after the notice by Luke. When therefore the Jewish historian describes Abilene as the tetrarchy of Lysanias, it is perhaps more probable, that he refers to the more recent Lysanias, whom Luke expressly calls tetrarch, than that he should mean the former Lysanias, who had now been dead nearly seventy years, and who is nowhere even mentioned as a tetrarch nor in connection with Abilene.

Yet it is not an improbable inference, as we have seen above, that Abilene did form part of the possessions of the first Lysanias, and also of his father Ptolemy. After the murder of Lysanias, and apparently during the minority of his children, his territories were farmed by Zenodorus, probably for the benefit of his family; for in no other way can we so well account for their being *farmed* at all. The son of Lysanias, on reaching his majority, would naturally be reïnstated in his father's dominions; and the second Lysanias may have been the son or grandson of the first. If a son, he must have been, when Luke wrote, not far from seventy years of age. His territories would seem to have reverted, after his decease, to the emperor; perhaps from failure of other heirs; and we find Caligula and Claudius bestowing them on Herod Agrippa as part of their own property.

The preceding considerations and suggestions are all of them probable inferences from recorded facts; and they serve to remove all trace of the difficulties, which have been supposed to cluster around the passage in Luke. The mere silence of the Jewish historian as to the family succession in a small district out of Palestine, can, on no principle of historic evidence, have here any weight against the express testimony of the Evangelist; supported too, as it is, by other incidental facts narrated by the historian.

Abila. The position of Abila, the chief town of Abilene, is definitely given by ancient writers, as between Heliopolis (Báalbek) and Damascus.

The geographer *Ptolemy* enumerates the several cities in this order: *Heliopolis, Abila of Lysanias, Saana, Ina, Damascus.*

In the *Synekdemos of Hierocles* we find less definitely: *Heliopolis, Abila, Palmyra.*[1]

The *Itinerary of Antoninus*, and also the *Peutinger Tables*, afford more specific notices:

Itin. Anton.[2]	*Tabula Peut.*[3]
Heliopoli.	Eliopoli.
Abila. M. P. XXXVIII.	Abila. M. P. XXXII.
Damasco. M. P. XVIII.	Damasco. M. P. XVIII.

From these notices it is apparent, that Abila was situated *eighteen* Roman miles from Damascus on the great road towards Báalbek; a distance which in the ascent of Anti-Lebanon is equivalent to about

[1] *Itineraria*, ed. Wesseling. p. 717.—Dr. Wilson in his 'Lands of the Bible,' II. p. 374, quotes this passage incorrectly thus: *Heliopolis, Abila, Damascus.*

[2] Ed. Wesseling. p. 198. See also p. 199, where there is a manifest error in transcription.

[3] Ed. Scheyb, Segm. IX. F.

eight hours in the usual mode of travel. At the present day, a course of about eight hours brings the traveller to the village called *Sûk Wady el-Barada.*[1] This place is situated on the north side of the Baradas, near the point where that river issues from the gorge by which it breaks down through the first ridge or offset of the mountain below the plain of Zebedâny. This chasm is described as wild and highly picturesque; "it is very deep; and on each side are remains of ancient buildings and caves, the work of men's hands.[2] The stream has wrought itself a deep and narrow channel, sometimes only a few fathoms wide; and on the sides the naked limestone walls rise perpendicularly to the height of several hundred feet. In this chasm, on both sides of the stream, and especially on the north side, where there is a huge acclivity of the rock of great height, are excavated many sepulchres; some of them with fine portals, and with steps leading up to the entrance. The ravine below is strown with broken columns and the remnants of walls. The whole aspect of the spot is that of the necropolis of an ancient adjacent city.[3]

In the neighboring village too, there are "evident remains of former edifices. Slight modern houses are often raised on ancient massive foundations. Well-squared stones, many of considerable size, lie about in all directions. On an elevated point, which commands a fine prospect down the valley, are fragments of large and small columns. A few broken shafts still retaining their position, prove by their situation and magnitude, that they once belonged to an important structure."[4]

The road follows the river through the pass; and is in some parts hewn in the rock,—in three places, according to Pococke; "first, for about twenty yards, the rock being about twenty feet high on each side; then for about forty yards, the rock being fifty feet high; the third passage is near the same length, but the rock is only ten feet in height."[5] Another traveller describes the road as divided "into two or three narrow passes, deeply cut through that part of the rocky summit which is opposite to the necropolis. These deep tracks, that do not allow two horses to pass each other, make a sharp angle or two, as if to admit of being easily defended; and then unite, at some distance beyond, into a road of ordinary width."[6]

All these circumstances serve to show conclusively, that here was

---

[1] Burckhardt's Travels in Syria, p. 2. Wilson's Lands of the Bible, II. p. 370, 372.
[2] Taunûs in Bibl. Res. III. App. 146.
[3] Hogg's Visit to Damascus, I. p. 296. Russegger's Reisen, I. p. 722.
[4] Hogg's Visit, etc. I. p. 299 sq.
[5] Descr. of the East, II. p. 115. [6] Hogg's Visit, etc. I. p. 297.

the site of an ancient town of importance; and the specifications of the Itineraries show just as conclusively, that it was the Abila of Lysanias. Indeed it is surprising that a spot so very distinctly marked, and that too upon the great road from Damascus to the sea-coast, should have been lost sight of for so many centuries. Our surprise is increased, when we find that Abila long continued to be an episcopal city of Phenicia in Lebanon; one of her bishops, Jordan, having been present at the council of Chalcedon A. D. 451; and another, Alexander, being mentioned under the emperor Justin I, in A. D. 518.[1]

On the opposite or south side of the Barada, a little further down, rises a high and steep hill, crowned by the ruins of an edifice known among the Arabs as the tomb of the prophet Abel (Neby Habil); where, they say, Cain buried the dead body of his brother. This tomb is mentioned by Gumpenberg and Radzivil, and perhaps by other travellers of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. But Maundrell, in 1697, seems to have been the first to connect this name in any way with Abila; remarking simply, that it is "supposed to be the tomb of Abel, and to have given the adjacent country in old times the name of Abilene!"[2] Now the converse of this is very probably true; the name Abel (Habil) being here nothing more than a popular traditional reminiscence of the neighboring Abila. Pococke visited the spot in the year 1738, and describes the building as "a most beautiful church uncovered;" and, what is more to the purpose, he found there a Greek inscription upon a large stone fixed in the inside of the church, which seemed to be in verse, "and to run in the first person, beginning with the year, and afterwards making mention of Lysanias, tetrarch of Abilene."[3] Pococke regards this inscription as a confirmation that Abila was near. In this he was correct. The church most probably was dependent on or connected with that city; and thus acquired on the lips of an ignorant peasantry its present appellation.

Pococke heard of, but did not visit, the present village of Sûk; "where," he says, "as I was afterwards informed, there is an inscription on a stone near the river."[4] This is the earliest intimation of an inscription on the site of Abila. Nothing further was heard of it until A. D. 1822; when the London Quarterly Review, in its celebrated article on Buckingham's Travels in Palestine, in pointing out a gross blunder of that writer, held the following language: "There is not, in fact, any position more certainly ascertained than that of Abila of Lysanias. It stood upon the river Barrady, on the road between Da-

[1] Le Quien Oriens Christ. II. 843.
[2] Journey, p. 180.
[3] Descr. of the East, II. p. 115, 116.
[4] Ibid. II. p. 115.

mascus and Báalbec, where its tombs are still to be seen; and Mr. Bankes has brought home a long inscription, (not observed by former travellers,) copied from the face of a rock there, in which the Abilenians record the making of a new road to their city."[1] Mr. Bankes has never published the inscription; and the above statement, as will be seen below, is not quite correct. Still, the notice was immediately referred to by Gesenius, and has ever since been regarded, as fixing the site of Abila.[2]

Later inquiries have brought to light *two* inscriptions; of which only one makes mention of Abila. They were published by Letronne in the *Journal des Savans* for March 1827; but not having present access to that work, I am unable to say from whom he derived them. Thence they passed into Orelli's work: *Inscr. Lat. select. Collectio,* Nos. 4997, 4998. During the present year, copies of these and various other inscriptions, taken by Dr. De Forest of the American Mission in Syria, have been transmitted by him to Prof. Salisbury of Yale College. The two in question have been examined, and the different copies collated by President Woolsey, who has kindly communicated them to me, with his notes, for publication in connection with this article. The position of the inscriptions is described by Dr. De Forest as follows: "At the village called Sûk Wady el-Barada, and opposite the hill called Neby Habil, we examined inscriptions and tombs, broken columns, etc. The inscriptions are on the face of a rock, through which was cut a Roman road, high above the present path. They are quite distinct, except a few letters."[3]

The letter of President Woolsey is here subjoined; and the notes which follow in marks of quotation are also by him.

"*Yale College, Sept.* 24, 1847.

"Dear Sir,—A few days ago, when you were in New Haven, we conversed, as you will recollect, concerning a few inscriptions copied [in May 1846] by Dr. De Forest of the Syrian Mission of the American Board; and not long since sent by that gentleman to Prof. Salisbury. One of the inscriptions interested you, as being thought to point out the site of Abila of Lysanias; and you requested me to send you a copy. You will remember that I told you a copy had been published as early as in 1827 by Letronne, in the *Journal des Savans* for March; whence it was transferred to Orelli's well known collection.

---

[1] Quart. Rev. Vol. XXVI. No. 52. p. 388.

[2] Gesen. Notes to Burckhardt's Syria, I. p. 537. Hogg's Visit to Damascus, I. p. 301.

[3] Manuscr. Letter. See also Wilson's Lands of the Bible, II. p. 373.

My attention was first called to this fact by Prof. Johnson of the New York University. I send you, however, Dr. De Forest's copy, which differs in a few points from that which Letronne published; and subjoin some notes upon the discrepances between the two.

Dr. De Forest.	*Orelli, No.* 4997.
IMPCAESMAVRELANTONINVS	IMP. CAES. M. AVREL. ANTONINVS
AVGARMENIACVSET	AVG. ARMENIACVS ET
IMPCAESLAVRELIVERVSAYGAR	IMP. CAES. L. AVREL. VERVS. AVG. AR
MENIACVSVIAMFLVMINIS	MENIACVS VIAM FLVMINIS
VIABRVBTAMINTER	VI ABRVPTAM INTERCISO
MONTERESTITVRVNTPER	MONTE RESTITVERVNT PER
IVLVERVMLEGRPROVINC	IVL. VERVM LEG. PR. PR. PROVINC
SYRETAMICVMSVVM	SVR. ETAMICVM SVVM
INPENDIISABILENORVM	IMPENDIIS ABILENORVM

"In the *third* line Orelli's copy denotes Aurelius by AVREL. not by AVRELI. and is no doubt right in this.

"In the *fifth* line Orelli reads ABRVPTAM, which must be probably a correction by the editor or copier of the barbarous ABRVBTAM. In the same line we find INTERCISO, perhaps as a restoration, but seemingly a necessary one.

"In the *sixth* line, Dr. De Forest's RESTITVRVNT may be due to the stone-cutter.

"In the *seventh* line, instead of LEGR, Orelli has the reading LEG. PR. PR. but adds no explanation. This must be the true reading, and the words are in full: *Legatum pro Praetore Provinciae Syriae.* Comp. Orelli 3672, l. 7 *Legato pro Praetore Provinciae Numidiae,* written without abbreviation.

"In the *eighth* line, Orelli has SVR. that is, V for Y. This would be old Latin, as is said by Conrad Schneider expressly of this word (Lat. Gr. I. 42); and therefore, for the time of the inscription, not so probable as SYR.

"In the *last* line Dr. De Forest gives us INPENDIIS for IMPENDIIS, which may be the true spelling of the original stone. We find likewise INPIA for IMPIA, Orelli 4651; and by neglect of assimilation, INRITAS for IRRITAS, Orelli 3115."

In accordance with these remarks, it will be seen, that the copy of Orelli, as above given, is properly corrected and restored, excepting the SVR. of the last line. The inscription therefore, when fully written out, is as follows:

Imperator Caesar Marcus Aurelius Antoninus | Augustus Armeniacus et | Imperator Caesar Lucius Aurelius Verus Augustus Ar | meniacus viam fluminis vi abruptam interciso | monte restituerunt per | Julium Verum Legatum pro Praetore Provinciae | Syriae et amicum suum | impendiis Abilenorum.

The second inscription, which is understood to be near the former, "ab altero latere" says Orelli, is as follows:

Dr. De Forest.	*Orelli, No.* 4998.
PROSALVTE	PRO SALVTE
IMPAVGANTONI	IMP. AVG. ANTONI
NIETVERIMVO	NI ET VERIM. VO
LVSIVSMAXIMVS	LVSIVS MAXIMVS
⊤LEGXVIEP	⊤. LEG. F. F.
OVIOPERIIN	QVI OPERI IN
STITVTVS	STITIT V. S.

"In the *third* line, Orelli exhibits VERI IM. VO; but this must be wrong. It cannot be *Veri Imperatoris;* for it would be usage to write IMP before the name, not IM after it. M. is therefore here for *Marcus.*

"In the *fifth* line the two copies differ very much. Orelli has ⊤. LEG. F. F. The first mark, a T without the horizontal part on the right, he explains as standing for *Tribunus;* but Dr. De Forest's *siglum* is ⊤, which often stands in inscriptions to denote *Centurio.* Next follows in Orelli LEG. F. F. that is, as he explains it, *Legionis Flaviae Firmae.* Dr. De Forest's copy gives XVI. EP after LEG. It is worthy of remark, that if we suppose Dr. De Forest to have copied XVI. correctly, and then put F. F. in the place of EP. all will be clear. M. Volusius becomes a centurion of the sixteenth Legion *Flavia Firma* or *Flavia Fidelis.* By the former epithets this legion is designated in Orelli's Inscr. 90 and 364; and by the latter in 3393.

"In the *sixth* line Orelli has QVI for OVI, and no doubt correctly.

"In the *last* line Orelli's copy, with greater correctness, has INSTITIT V. S. i. e. perhaps: *qui operi institit, voto suscepto.*"

Hence, the inscription written out in full, may be read as follows:

Pro salute | Imperatorum Augustorum Antoni | ni et Veri Marcus Vo | lusius Maximus | Centurio Legionis XVI Flaviae Firmae [Fidelis] | qui operi institit voto suscepto.

Such are the inscriptions. The first thing that strikes us is the flourish of trumpets in the longer one in behalf of the emperors Antoninus and Verus and their Propraetor of Syria Julius Verus, *at the expense of the Abilenians!* Another remark is, that the first inscription, of itself and apart from the remains, does not necessarily fix the site of Abila upon that spot. Had the inscription commemorative of a like cutting near the mouth of the Nahr el-Kelb, contained a similar clause relative to the inhabitants of Beirût, it would by no means follow that the ancient Berytus was situated at the mouth of the river Lycus.

The date of the inscriptions is fixed very nearly by the imperial title *Armeniacus*, assumed on occasion of the triumph held by both emperors after the subjugation of Armenia by Verus. This triumph took place in A. D 166, and Verus died in A. D. 169. The first inscription, at least, falls within this interval.

A copy of the inscriptions was also communicated by Dr. De Forest to the Rev. Mr. Graham, Scottish Missionary in Damascus; by whom they were transmitted to the Rev. Dr Wilson, author of the "Lands of the Bible"; in which work they appear in a corrected form, though not collated with the copy of Orelli. The main differences are the following. The seventh line of the first inscription is made to read: LEG. PR. PROVINC, that is, PR. for *proconsul* evidently by conjecture. Again, the fifth line of the second inscription reads LEG. XVI. F. F, the *siglum*, ⅂ being omitted; while in the sixth and seventh lines the readings OVI and INSTITVTVS are retained. In this inscription also the lines are differently divided. Dr Wilson, who himself passed that way, "did not stop to examine the tombs, or aqueducts, or ruins which he observed from the road at the Sûk Wady el-Barada."[1]

It is proper to state, that there is some confusion among travellers in respect to the name of the village which now occupies the site of Abila. The best authorities give it as above es-Sûk Wady el-Barada, i. e. the Market of Wady el-Barada. But Burckhardt, usually a good authority, calls this place simply es-Sûk; and gives the name of Sûk Barada to a village an hour and a quarter further down the river. Half an hour below Huseinîyeh, apparently the Fâris Zeid of Mr. Smith's lists and the El-Ekfaire el-Feite of Buckingham.[2] Burckhardt himself remarks, that "Sûk (market) is an appellation often added to villages which have periodical markets;" and his error (for such it seems to be) probably arose from this circumstance. It is true that G. Robinson and Russegger both speak of such a lower village Sûk Barada;[3] but their whole context shows that they were merely writing out from Burckhardt (the latter perhaps also from Berghaus' Map); and not from any notes or observations of their own. The same is the case with the Itinerary of Berggren, appended to his Travels in the Swedish original.[4]

---

[1] Lands of the Bible, II. p. 373, 374.

[2] Burckh. Travels in Syr. p. 2. Bibl. Res. in Pal. III. App. p. 147. Buckingh. Arab tribes, p. 389.

[3] G. Robinson' Travels, etc. II. p. 113. Russegger's Reisen, I. p. 723.

4 Resor, etc. III. Itin. p. 39.

P. S. This article was already completed, as above, when I found, in the recent work of Krafft on the Topography of Jerusalem,[1] another copy of the inscriptions in question, made by that writer in 1845; accompanied by a somewhat more definite account of the spot where they are found.

According to this account in passing down from Zebedâny, before the traveller issues from the narrow gorge as he approaches the village Sûk Wady el-Barada, there is near the bridge and high up on the northern declivity a portion of the rock hewn to an inclined surface, sixty paces long, upon which the inscriptions are found, *each of them twice.* . . . Still higher on the mountain is a channel cut through the rock for the water,—an immense Roman work, which protected this important road to Damascus from any further fall of the mountain. A little below this, towards the village, and in the same northern mountain, is an ancient necropolis, and several sepulchres with well executed sculptures.

Of the larger inscription Krafft gives only one copy; and this is identical with that of Orelli as above given, except that in the last line but one it reads SYR instead of the SVR of Orelli. This accords with the suggestion of President Woolsey.

Of the other inscription Krafft gives both copies, as follows:

PROSALVTE	PROSALVTE
IMPAVGANTONI	IMPAVGANTO
NIETVERIMVO	NINIETVERI
LVSIVSMAXIMVS	MVOLVSVSI
¬LEGXVI FF	MAXIMVS¬
QVIOPEREIN	LEGXVIFFQVI
STITITV.S.	OPERIINSTITVS

These two copies of the same inscription vary in respect to the division of the lines; and also in some points near the close; e. g. OPERE for OPERI. They show that the stone-cutter did not always do his work accurately. They thus serve to correct and elucidate each other; and further, they confirm in every particular the suggestions of President Woolsey, in his notes. In both the inscriptions therefore, the readings proposed by him turn out to be the true and actual readings of the inscriptions themselves.

II. Chalcis.

The city and district of Chalcis is not indeed referred to in Scripture; but it was held by some of Herod's descendants, one of whom

[1] Die Topographie Jerusalem, von W. Krafft, Bonn 1846, p. 269.

at least is mentioned in the book of Acts. It has sometimes been regarded as identical with the Chalcis situated a few miles south of Aleppo, and now called Kinneserîn.[1] Reland pointed out the distinction; but did not dwell upon it.[2]

Josephus relates that Pompey, marching southwards from his winter-quarters probably at or near Antioch, about the year 63 before Christ, razed the citadel in Apamea on the Orontes; passed through the cities Heliopolis (Báalbek) and *Chalcis;* and crossing the mountain which shuts in Coele-Syria, proceeded from Pella to Damascus, Antt. 14. 3. 2. Of this city and district Ptolemy the son of Mennaeus (already mentioned above) was then lord; and Josephus expressly describes it as *under Mount Lebanon;* Antt. 14. 7. 4. B. J. 1. 9. 2. He was succeeded by his son, the first Lysanias; whose possessions after his murder by Antony, were farmed by Zenodorus, as above related. Many years later, A. D. 41, Claudius in the first year of his reign, bestowed Chalcis on Herod, a brother of the elder [Herod] Agrippa; and gave him also the oversight of the temple at Jerusalem, and the right of appointing the high-priests; Antt. 19. 5. 1. ib. 19. 8. 1. 3. ib. 20. 1. 3. After his death about A. D. 48, Chalcis went to his nephew, the younger Agrippa, mentioned in the book of Acts; B. 2. J. 12. 1. He held it four years, and was then transferred, with the title of king, to the provinces formerly held by Philip, his father's uncle, and afterwards by his father, viz. Batanea, Trachonitis, Abilene, and others; Antt. 20. 7. 1.

All these notices show very definitely, that the Chalcis in question was situated in the Bŭkâ'a, probably somewhere south of Ba'albek. The valley has never yet been examined with any reference to the site of this city. When this shall have been done, it is not impossible but that its position may be recovered, perhaps at Zahlah, which must always have been a point of importance; perhaps at Majdel Anjar, where Abulfeda speaks of great ruins of hewn stones.[3] The district of Chalcis appears to have extended around or across the northern end of Lebanon to the sea; for Josephus speaks also of Arka as pertaining to the dominions of Agrippa; B. J. 7. 5. 1.

III. Great Inscription at Apamea.

Along with the inscriptions at Abila, as mentioned above, Dr. De Forest sent home also copies of several others found in northern Syria. These are quite fragmentary, and consist mostly of passages of Scrip-

[1] Cellarius Notit. Orb. II. p. 363, 364. [2] Palaest. p. 315 sq.
[3] Tab. Syr. ed Koehler, p. 20. Bibl. Res. in Palest. III. App. p. 142.

ture. The longest of them all is the one brought from Apamea, which is sufficiently defaced. It is found "in a tower in the wall of Kŭl'at el-Medîk, near the ruins of ancient Apamea. Above the inscription is a small figure now nearly obliterated, on whose right is a large M, and then the following inscription."

SEPTMIOZENO..STRATO
L..EC...PART...EVERIM
FEA E-----NAPRI
POSTERI-YIX M NLI-III
MLIT\ VITA MVXXILELM
MAXIMVS DDERES----
IANVS-EC ATAR--
B M P

The note of President Woolsey on the above, is as follows:

"It is probable that a skilful and practised hand may restore this inscription. In the second line, if we read EG for EC, and AN for M at the end, mention is made of a Parthian and Severian legion. Several legions bore these titles. Thus a *first* legion is called *Parthica Phillipiana* in inscriptions; and a *third*, *Parthica* simply. A first and several others are named after Severus.

"In the fourth line, 'vixit ann. L. I. [menses] III.,' seems plain.—In the sixth, "maximo desiderio suorum," a common formula, occurs to mind, without seeming to suit the connection.

"The seventh line seems to contain,the name of some one, perhaps a fellow-soldier, (EC being part of LEG,) who placed the inscription,—*bene merenti posuit.*"

Topography of Jerusalem.

Since the two articles on this subject in the numbers of this work for August and November 1846, no great change has taken place in the position of the question. Those articles have been translated into German, and published at Halle, under the supervision of Prof. Rödiger. The work of Krafft above alluded to, was published nearly simultaneously with the original articles; but, as is remarked by Rödiger in his introduction, "it follows in general so closely the results of Williams, as not to vary essentially the position of the controversy."

The author of that work has at last satisfied *himself* on various important points. Thus he says (p. i), "The question as to the situation of the hill Akra may now be regarded as at an end;" and again (p. vii), "In respect to the hill Golgotha, the identity of the same with the spot designated by ecclesiastical tradition, can no longer be doubt-

ed." Whether he will be able equally to remove all doubt from other minds, remains to be seen. The following may serve to give the reader a general idea of his accuracy and trust-worthiness.

In his preface (p. ix), he speaks of having found the sites of *thirty* ancient places, not before discovered; and he proceeds to describe two of them, *Ai* and *Gibeah*, as follows: "We found the ruins [of Ai], called by the Arabs *Medinet Chai*, not quite an hour eastward of Jaba (Gibeah of Saul) upon a hill above the declivity of Wady es-Suweînît. Half an hour further east, where the Suweînît unites with Wady Fa'rah, we came upon the ruins of Gibeah of Benjamin, called by the Arabs *Gobah*." Now the distance thus assigned between Ai and Bethel is not less than eight miles in a straight line, and much further by any possible road; whereas it appears from Josh. 8: 12, and still more from vv. 16, 17, that Ai and Bethel were at least not very far apart from each other. Again this writer, for the first time, makes a distinction between Gibeah of Benjamin and Gibeah of Saul; finding the latter at Jeba (the true Geba), and the former an hour and a half further east. But this distinction is unfounded, and his positions are both wrong; for the Gibeah of Saul and of Benjamin are obviously one and the same place; and as may be demonstrably shown from Josephus, that place was situated at the hill *Tuleil el-Fûl* near the great road some three miles north of Jerusalem. See Jos. B. J. 5. 2. 1. Biblioth. Sac. Aug. 1844, p. 598 sq.

Another beautiful volume on Jerusalem has been issued by James Ferguson, Esq.[1] It is the object of the author, on architectural grounds, to maintain the position that the present mosk of Omar, *es-Sükrah*, is the original church of the Holy Sepulchre erected by Constantine.

The main object of the present notice, is to introduce to the reader the following letter from the Rev. George B. Whiting, one of the missionaries of the American Board in Syria. Mr. Whiting, it may be remembered, was for several years a resident in the Holy City; and to his kindness and minute information I was very greatly indebted during my visit there in 1838. In his present visit he was accompanied by the late Prof. Fiske of Amherst College, a man of strong powers of mind and keen observation, who died during the visit and found his last resting-place on Mount Zion. He was a man of God; and I mourn in him the friend of many years.

It may be proper to remark, that the alleged remains of antiquity along the west side of the street of the Bazaars, are likewise rejected

[1] Essay on the ancient Topography of Jerusalem, with Illustrations. By James Ferguson, Esq. Lond. 1847.

by Krafft; who nevertheless regards the second wall as having run along that street.

"*Abeih, Mount Lebanon, 22d August,* 1847.

"My Dear Sir:—A few months ago I read with deep interest, and I may add with entire satisfaction, your two articles in the Bibliotheca Sacra on the Topography of Jerusalem. Being then about to revisit the Holy City, I resolved to examine anew some points on which much stress is laid by Mr. Williams, in his attempt to overthrow the position maintained in the Biblical Researches, in respect to the Tyropœon valley, and the course of the Second Wall.

"One of these points, and perhaps the most plausible one in Mr. Williams's argument, is the alleged fact, that along the street running eastward from the Jaffa gate, at the northern base of Mount Zion, where you find the commencement of the Tyropœon, there *are no traces of a valley to be found;* and that the street called 'Harat en-Nusăra,' or *Christian* street, which leads out of the street last named towards the north, is *perfectly level.* Now, it must be conceded that this 'Christian street' is, at the point where it leaves the other (the Jaffa-gate street), nearly or quite level; and yet as you go northward there certainly is a gradual ascent, through almost the whole length of the street. And if, as you suggest, the course of the street were turned a few points westward, the ascent would be more rapid.

"But a more conclusive answer to the argument of Mr. W., is the fact, also suggested by you, that there is undoubtedly a large accumulation of rubbish, all along the northern base of Mount Zion, by which the old valley has been filled up. This fact is not only rendered extremely probable by the existence of a great depth of rubbish and old buildings on all the northern parts of Zion, as was found to be the case in digging for the foundations of the English Church, and for those of the barracks erected by Ibrahim Pasha; but it is now proved *by excavations actually made* at different points in the valley itself. So that the argument upon the present level appearance of the ground in question, is literally an argument resting upon *rubbish.* It has no solid foundation.

"But I am detaining you too long from the information which it is the object of this letter to communicate, and which clearly establishes the important fact in question. While walking in company with the late Prof. Fiske, through the enclosure once occupied by the great palace or hospital of the Knights of St. John, our attention was arrested by a large heap of rubbish freshly thrown up, lying near by the little Greek church in the south-west corner of the enclosure. On en-

tering the yard of this church, we found people digging for foundations on which to erect additional buildings. They had already excavated to the depth of some fifteen or twenty feet (as we estimated), through nothing but rubbish, and had just then come upon the top of a vaulted room, the depth of which could not yet be seen. The men said it was understood there was an ancient *chapel* there, long since buried beneath the ruins and rubbish of other buildings. Whether the vaulted room, the top of which we saw, was the said chapel or not, or whether it belonged to the first, or the second, or the third story of a structure long since buried and lost, we of course could not tell. But supposing it to have been on the first or lower story, the original foundations must have been at least thirty or forty feet below the present surface. They may have been much deeper than that. Now, this spot is within a few yards of the 'Jaffa-gate' street—precisely where, on your theory, we should look for the Tyropœon valley filled up with rubbish. I need not tell you how much we were interested in this discovery; which we instantly resolved to make you acquainted with.

"I proceed to mention another fact of the same sort. On this same 'Jaffa-gate' street, at a point further up towards the gate, a large new building has lately been erected. It stands opposite the castle on the corner of the street leading north from the main street towards the Latin convent. Of course then, this building stands directly over the bed of your Tyropœon Valley; and here also we should look for a considerable accumulation of rubbish. I inquired of a European merchant, who occupies a part of the building, and who said he was present when it was erected, whether in digging to lay the foundations, much depth of rubbish was found? 'A very great depth,' he replied. 'How deep do you think the excavations were?' 'O, I don't know,' he said, 'but *very deep*. Look at the height of that castle wall; the depth of our excavations was equal to that.' The part of the castle wall to which he pointed, cannot be less than forty or fifty feet high. 'Are you sure,' I said, 'your foundations were so deep?' 'Yes,' he answered with confidence, 'quite as deep as the height of that wall.'

"Our English friends in Jerusalem, like ourselves, were much interested in these facts; and regarded them as proving beyond all controversy, that there was formerly a deep valley or ravine along the course of this street. And it seems to me, that no unbiassed mind can doubt, after reading your very lucid reply to Williams and Schultz, that that valley was the Tyropœon.

"The new building above referred to, is perhaps not more than 100 or 150 yards from the Jaffa gate. Is it not probable that the valley

originally extended quite through to the valley of Hinnom, leaving Mount Zion entirely surrounded by the two valleys?

"Much has been said by Mr. Williams and others, about some supposed ancient remains, near the corner formed by the Jaffa-gate street and the street running north through the Bazaars; as also about a supposed 'Pier of an ancient gateway,' in the open grounds on the west of the Bazaars. Both of these points I took some pains to examine, in company with Prof. Fiske. The remains first mentioned, are nothing more nor less than a *square corner*, in a good state of preservation, of the celebrated palace of the Knights of St. John. You may recollect a row of arches, almost entire, along the north side of this Jaffa-gate street, extending from near the Bazaars, almost up to the 'Christian Street.' This row of arches, I believe it is on all hands admitted, belongs to the Crusades, and evidently formed the south basement of the great palace of the Knights. The square corner alluded to, is a continuation or more correctly, the termination of this row of arches. It is exactly on a line with them, and built in the very same style, the stones being of the same shape and size with those of the arches and buttresses.

"Looking northward from this corner of the old palace, we noticed, exactly on a line with the eastern face of it, and about midway between it and the north side of the palace enclosure, Mr. Williams's 'pier of a gateway,' which he says is, in its style of architecture, different from anything he had seen in Jerusalem, and, as he thinks, of high antiquity. Now, if Mr. W. had carefully compared this relic with the row of arches above-mentioned, he would have found that the style of architecture is precisely the same in both. Even the shape and dimensions of the stones are the same in both. The stones are mostly of an oblong form, three or four feet in length, as I should think, and perhaps a little less than two feet in breadth and thickness. And further, if he had looked from the top of the corner, already described, across the open ground to this 'pier of a gateway,' he would have been satisfied that both the 'pier' and the 'corner,' are part and parcel of one and the same building, and that the old palace of the Knights of St. John. I think you have suggested in your review, that this was one of the gates of the said palace; and it seems to me that no one, who carefully compares the several remains now alluded to, can doubt for a moment that such is the fact.

I remain, my dear Sir, with great respect,

Most truly yours,

G. B. Whiting.

"P. S.—Mr. Smith lent me the sheets of your article, and I left them with Dr. McGowan, of Jerusalem, for the edification of travel-

lers. Dr. M. is much interested in the subject; is quite convinced of the correctness of your views, and has promised to keep an eye upon those excavations, and any others that may be made, and to communicate to me anything interesting that he may discover.

G. B. W.

Rev. Dr. Robinson."

ARTICLE V.

ANALYSIS OF THE ARGUMENT IN THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

By Prof. H. B. Hackett, Newton Theol. Institution.

The epistle to the Galatians is one of the most argumentative of all the New Testament epistles; both in this respect and in point of doctrinal importance, it stands confessedly next to the epistles to the Romans and the Hebrews. The following is an attempt to exhibit with conciseness a logical outline of the contents of this epistle. It will be perceived that in two or three instances the course of thought as developed here, is founded on passages which are controverted, and which some might choose to understand differently;[1] but for the most part, the nerve of the argument will be found to be contained in expressions which by general consent admit of only one explanation.

The general object of the epistle was to arrest the progress of the false sentiments respecting the mode of acceptance with God, which the Judaizing errorists were spreading in the Galatian churches, and to bring back the Galatians to their original dependence on Christ as the only foundation of their hope of salvation. For the accomplishment of this object, the writer adapting himself to the course pursued by his opponents aims, first, to establish his claim to a full equality as an apostle with the other acknowledged apostles of our Lord; second, to explain and confirm the true doctrine of justification by grace alone in opposition to that of works; and, finally, to administer such counsels and reproofs as the moral condition of the Galatians required. Of these three parts into which the epistle divides itself, the first may be termed *apologetic*, including the first two chapters, the second *doctrinal* or *dogmatic*, including the third and fourth chapters, and the

[1] This remark applies, however, almost exclusively to 3: 19. 5: 11.

third *practical*, embracing the two remaining chapters. These three divisions follow each other in strict logical order. The first is necessary to the second, since without an admission of the writer's apostolic authority, his subsequent exposition of the way of salvation would have possessed the weight only of an ordinary human opinion, instead of being as it now is, authoritative and final; and since, on the other hand, the great peculiarity of the plan of salvation on which he insists is its opposition to the system of law or works, the third part becomes obviously a necessary complement to the second. Those who profess to rely on this method of justification, are to avoid the error of supposing that because they are separated from the law as a source of merit, they are released from it also as a rule for the government of their lives.

A more particular analysis of the course of thought is as follows. In the introduction, Paul asserts in the strongest manner, the divine origin of his apostleship, and his appointment to it without any human intervention, and invokes on the Galatians the usual benediction from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ. In this connection he brings incidentally into view the sacrifice and death of Christ as the means of human salvation, and thus announces the great theme of the epistle at the outset, 1: 1—5.

He then proceeds to express his astonishment at the sudden defection of the Galatians from the truth, characterizes the error which they had embraced, or were in danger of embracing, as an utter and fatal perversion of the gospel, and in the most emphatic terms pronounces the conduct of those, who had persuaded them to this course, to be deserving of the severest reprobation and punishment. The plan of salvation as preached by himself, was so certainly and unalterably the only possible way of salvation, that any different system though taught by an angel from heaven, must be rejected, at once, as false merely on the ground of such difference, 1: 6—10.

In vindication of the right, thus asserted, to declare as an infallible teacher what the truth is, Paul enters next upon an argument to show, first, that he had received his doctrine as to the mode of salvation, not from any human teaching but by direct revelation; and, second, that this doctrine thus communicated to him, was demonstrated to be true by a consideration of its own nature, its effects, its harmony with Scripture, its attestation by miracles and other similar evidences.

First; his knowledge of the gospel is proved to have been not of human but divine origin, negatively by the fact that immediately on his conversion, he entered on the full exercise of his office as an apostle without any consultation with human advisers, 1: 11—17; that he

preached the gospel for years without any intercourse or even personal acquaintance with the apostles, and that when at length he went to Jerusalem and saw some of their number, it was a visit of friendship merely, and had no relation whatever to his attainment of a fuller knowledge of the Christian doctrines, 1: 18—24. Again, the same thing is proved affirmatively, by the fact that on his coming at a later period into fuller connection with the apostles, his views of truth were sanctioned by them as perfectly coïncident with theirs, who had been taught personally by our Lord, 2: 1—6; that he was recognized by them, as standing in all respects, officially, on a level with themselves, 2: 7—10; and that so far from having ever acted in subordination to them, or having acknowledged any dependence on them, he had on a memorable occasion, at Antioch, opposed the very chief of them, viz. Peter, reproving him, publicly and to his face, for having practically abandoned the great principle of justification by faith alone, inasmuch as he had timidly concealed for a time his real convictions, and acted as if Jewish rites must be superadded to faith in Christ as essential to salvation, 2: 11—21. In confirmation of these statements, Paul presents a brief outline of his well known history, adapted to show that he could have become such as he was and that he was in fact such as he claimed to be, in consequence only of having been appointed to his work by God himself, and qualified for it by endowments received immediately from him.

Having thus, in the first two chapters, vindicated his authority as an apostle, or in other words, shown that the gospel which he preached must be true, because he was taught it by direct revelation, Paul proceeds, in the next place, to argue the truth of the gospel from a consideration of the system, both as viewed in itself and as attested by the appropriate external marks of its divine character. A summary of the argument as developed in this connection, is the following. The gratuitous system of justification as contained in the gospel, must be the true one in opposition to that of merit or works, first, because the Holy Spirit accompanies its reception as a witness that those who embrace it, are adopted as the children of God, 3: 2—4; second, because it has been sanctioned by miracles, 3: 5; third, because it accords with the manner in which Abraham was justified, 3: 6, 7; fourth, because it fulfils the predictions of the Old Testament, in which it was foretold that Christ was to be the medium through which spiritual blessings should be conferred on mankind, 3: 8, 9; and fifth, because it is the only system adapted to men as sinners. In confirmation of the last point it is shown, that, on the ground of obedience justification is impossible, because the obedience which the law demands,

must be perfect; and as no individual renders this, it is evident that as many as are of the law, are under a curse. Under these circumstances, therefore, Christ gave himself as a ransom to redeem us from the curse of the law, being made himself a curse for us and thus providing a way of salvation which is applicable to all, Gentiles as well as Jews, on condition of faith, 3: 10—17.

The objection which might be urged against a part of the above reasoning, that the legal economy as established by Moses having been given subsequently to the time of Abraham, had placed men on a different footing in regard to the attainment of spiritual blessings, is answered by saying that the supposition is forbidden by the character of God. Even human contracts, when once ratified, remain binding on the parties, and nothing at variance with the original stipulations may afterwards be added to them. In justifying Abraham by faith, God entered into a virtual engagement to bestow the heavenly inheritance, always and only, on the same condition; and the giving of the law, therefore, which was a subsequent transaction, could not have annulled the promise in this respect, 3: 15—18.

But if the law have no value as a means of enabling us to establish a claim to the divine favor, of what advantage is it, the objector demands, 3: 19. In reply to this question, the apostle explains the great object of law to be, to prepare men for the reception of the gospel by awakening them to a consciousness of their sins and convincing them of their need of the deliverance from guilt and condemnation, which the redemption of Christ affords, 3: 20—22. We may suppose that while Paul would describe this as the office of law in general and one, therefore, which it is adapted still to perform as a means of bringing men to Christ, he means to affirm it here more especially of the Mosaic economy, that great embodiment of the legal principle, which was established to prepare the way for another and better system; and then as to its outward forms, its rites and symbols, was destined to come to an end, 3: 23—25. Under this more perfect system which is realized in Christ, those who were only the natural descendants of Abraham, become by faith his spiritual seed; those who were servants groaning under the bondage of sin and the law, become free, 3: 26—29. Those who were children in a state of minority and pupilage, are advanced to the dignity of sons and heirs of God, and receive the seal of their adoption as such in the presence of the Spirit of God in their hearts, 4: 1—7.

In view of this superiority of the Christian dispensation to the Jewish, Paul then remonstrates with the Galatians on their folly and ingratitude in turning back to the beggarly elements of the latter, 4: 8

—11. He adds his most earnest entreaty that they would return and trust again with him in Christ; he strengthens this appeal by a touching allusion to their former affection for him, and distinctly apprises them that in becoming alienated from him they had been made the dupes of artful men, whose pretended zeal for the law originated in the most interested and unworthy motives, 4: 12—20.

This second part of the discussion he closes, by employing the history of Abraham and his family as an allegory or illustration of the two systems which he has been considering. The points of comparison which are suggested here, are such as these. Judaism or the legal system, of which Ishmael who was of servile origin, may be considered as a type, imposes a spiritual bondage on those who adhere to it; whereas Christianity which is a free dispensation and hence fitly represented by Isaac, the son of a free woman, liberates men from their bondage and makes them the children of God. Again, as Ishmael was born in a mere natural way, so the Jews are a mere natural seed; but Christians, who obtain justification in conformity with the promise made to Abraham, are the true promised seed, even as Isaac was. Further, as of old Ishmael persecuted Isaac, the child of promise, so it is not to be accounted strange that under the gospel the natural seed, that is, the Jews, should persecute the spiritual seed, that is, Christians. And, finally, as Isaac was acknowledged as the true heir but Ishmael was set aside, so must it be as to the difference which exists between Jews and believers; the former, or in other words, those who depend on their own merit for obtaining the favor of God, will be rejected, while those who seek it by faith, shall realize the blessing, 4: 21—31. By means of this illustration, which was intended not so much to convince the understanding as to impress the memory, the apostle skilfully recapitulates the prominent doctrinal ideas of the epistle, and at the same time leaves them so associated in the minds of the Galatians with a familiar and striking portion of sacred history, that they could never have been easily forgotten.

The practical part of the epistle then follows. The apostle here exhorts the Galatians to maintain their liberty in Christ, because the surrender of it would deprive them of all benefit from the gospel and render them debtors to keep the whole law in order to be saved, 5: 1—6. He reminds them of the sad contrast between their present state and the commencement of their Christian career, and desires that they might be restored to the condition which they had left, even though the formal excision of those who had misled them, might be necessary for this purpose, 5: 7—12. He then turns to warn them against an abuse of their Christian liberty, enjoins upon them an ob-

servance of the law as a rule of duty, the essence of which is love, and whose requirement in this respect they would be enabled to fulfil by following the dictates of the Spirit, 5: 13—18. To enable them to judge whether they are actuated by the Spirit or an opposite principle, he enumerates, first, some of the works of the flesh, and then, the characteristic fruits of the Spirit, 5: 19—26.

He adds, in the last chapter, several general directions, such as relate, for example, to the spirit with which Christians should admonish those who fall into sin, the patience which they should exhibit towards each others' faults, the duty of providing for the wants of Christian teachers, and in short, performing unweariedly every good work with the assurance that in due time they should have their reward, 6: 1—10. He warns them once more against the sinister designs of those who were so earnest for circumcision, holds up to their view again the cross of Christ as that alone in which men should glory, and closes with a prayer for them as those whom he would still regard as brethren, 6: 11—18.

ARTICLE VI.

RECENT WORKS IN METAPHYSICAL SCIENCE.

By Noah Porter, Professor of Moral Philosophy and Metaphysics, Yale College.

An Historical and Critical View of the Speculative Philosophy of Europe in the nineteenth century. By J. D. Morell, A. M. In 2 vols. 2nd edition, revised and enlarged. London: John Johnstone 26 Paternoster Row, and 15 Princes Street, Edinburgh. 1847.

The same Work. New York and Pittsburg: Robert Carter. 1847.

The Works of Thomas Reid, D. D. Now fully collected with selections from his unpublished Letters. Preface, notes and supplementary dissertations by Sir William Hamilton, Bart. Advocate, etc. Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Edinburgh. Text collated and revised; useful distinctions inserted; leading words and propositions marked out; allusions indicated; quotations filled up. Prefixed, Stewart's account of the Life and Writings of Reid; with Notes by the editor. Copious indices subjoined. 1 *volume* (*incomplete*), *pp.* 914. Edinburgh: Maclachlan, Stewart and Co. London: Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans. 1846.

Dictionnaire des Sciences Philosophiques par une société de professeurs et de savants. (8 *Livraisons* 4 *volumes grand in* 8*vo.*) Paris Chez L. Hachette and Compagnie. 1846, 7.

The three works of which we have given the titles, are all of them of great interest to students of metaphysical or 'speculative' science. The first two especially deserve notice, as marking a new point in the history of the sciences in Great Britain. For they are fitted to wipe away the double reproach which has rested upon English students up to the present time, that they either did not care to acquaint themselves with the speculations of the continental philosophers, or were incompetent to appreciate and criticise them. The publication of Morell's History and the favor with which it has been received effectually refutes the first reproach; and an attentive study of the second work will dissipate, if it does not demolish, the other. The third work is too valuable for the American student not to deserve a friendly recognition.

The history of Morell is published in two handsome 8vo. volumes. It has passed to its second edition, which has received additions important in their extent and value. The author, as we are informed, is yet a young man who has devoted the beginnings of his manhood principally to metaphysical studies, and hopes to make these studies the occupation of his life. He has studied in the schools of Scotland, of Germany and of France, and has had the means of fully acquainting himself with the philosophers of the continent, not merely by reading their writings, but by hearing them in their lecture-rooms, and by mingling in their circles. These advantages he seems to have used with great diligence, and with an honest and impartial spirit. His work shows him to be a candid and truth-loving man, who aims to be unbiassed by any prejudices except an honorable attachment to the truth as distinguished from error, to science as opposed to scepticism, and to faith in that which is immortal and spiritual as contrasted with that which is earthly and sensual. His mind is clear, comprehensive and just, and his style is natural, graceful and easy. If there be any defects worth naming, they are that his intellect though superior does not evince the highest vigor and acuteness, and that his style lacks closeness, energy and point.

In the preface to the first edition, the author has given some account of his own philosophical studies and of the history of his opinions, as the most ready explanation of his object in preparing the work, and also of the character of the work itself, as indicated by the purpose for which it was written. He tells us that at first he studied Locke with

interest but without entire satisfaction, that he next read Brown and became an enthusiastic admirer and disciple of his system; he then went to Glasgow, and then his admiration for Brown began to abate and his esteem for Reid to rise. He then studied Kant's "Critique of Pure Reason" and some other works, but with the very common results of the student of German philosophy, of being unable to find a place for the "barbarous science" among the conclusions and methods of the philosophy with which he was already familiar. For the purpose of being relieved from this difficulty, or to find the clue by which the mystery of these writers could be explained, he very wisely went to Germany and there studied, as well as heard Fichte and Brandis [Braniss] lecture in the class-room. Here he was not entirely satisfied, for as it would seem he did not find the way to connect his new with his old philosophy, or to translate the new thoughts and phraseology to which he was introduced into those of the English and Scotch schools. He seems, however, to have mastered the principles and the nomenclature of the leading German systems and to have gathered the materials for future investigations. From Germany he went to France, and there he became acquainted with the principles of the eclectic school, which gave him more complete satisfaction than any other, and enabled him to understand the German and Scotch philosophies; as well as to find how far the same truths were recognized by both. It was in view of the field which he had been obliged to traverse without a guide, that he was induced to prepare the historical sketch which he has given in these two volumes; so that other students at the outset and during the progress of their inquiries might bear in their hands, a manual which should give them a general view of the various systems of recent philosophy, and should indicate their bearing upon the great matters and questions which make philosophy to be of any value. The work is not designed to be popular in any unworthy sense of the word. It is not a book designed for the people. It is not on the other hand designed to answer all the wants of philosophers. It does not so answer the questions, nor so discuss the problems, nor so thoroughly exhibit the system of any philosopher as to satisfy the inquirer who would investigate thoroughly for himself. It does however aim to give such an exhibition of the various systems of the nineteenth century, as to serve as an introduction to the study of any of them, or to the study of the history of all.

The work professes by its title to be a history of the philosophy of the nineteenth century. The author reasons, however, very justly, that the systems of this separate period cannot be understood, if considered by themselves alone. These systems begin where the philo-

sophy of the preceding century ended. For though Kant set off in a direction opposite to that of Hume, it is yet true that if it had not been for the philosophy of Hume, the philosophy of Kant would never have been produced, so that it is impossible fully to appreciate the one, without tracing its connections with the other. We cannot enter fully into the views of the later philosopher, and see under what influences and to establish what principles he wrote, unless we know the system against which he contended. In the same way we cannot comprehend Hume without studying Berkeley, nor can we fully understand Berkeley without having mastered Locke. As a writer of the history of the philosophy of the nineteenth century, he is almost of necessity forced to study that of the sources of these more recent systems. And as the entire system of modern philosophy is linked together in its several parts till we come to Descartes, who gave it its first movement, this historian of the nineteenth century becomes in fact the historian of modern philosophy. A very considerable portion of the first volume is taken up with an exhibition of the earlier modern philosophy under the title, "On the Proximate Sources of the Philosophy of the nineteenth century." This is the title of the first part of the entire work. The second part is "The Characteristics of the Philosophy of the nineteenth century." The third, which is the last and the briefest, is "The Tendencies of the Philosophy of the nineteenth century."

As an introduction to the discussion which is divided into these three parts, indicated under these heads, the author treats philosophy in general, in which in Sec. 1. he explains philosophy; in Sec. 2. he answers objections against it; in Sec. 3. he contends that its rise was inevitable; in Sec. 4. he exhibits the primary elements of human knowledge; after an exhibition of the categories of Aristotle, Kant and Cousin, he attempts to analyze our primary ideas; in Sec. 5. he divides all actual and possible systems of philosophy into sensationalism, idealism, skepticism, mysticism and eclecticism.

On these fourth and fifth sections we offer a word or two of criticism. The fourth section, though in its place it would be appropriate and necessary, yet seems to us altogether out of place in the introduction to a work like this. The reason is, that these generalizations, so baldly and briefly stated, with no illustrations, cannot be appreciated by any one of the class for which the work proposes to be particularly designed, if it indeed can be at all understood by such an one. It is the especial reproach of much of the philosophizing of the present day, that it is content with barren generalizations, which are repeated by those who do not comprehend the particulars for which they stand,

and whose scientific knowledge is but a jargon of empty sounds. This is eminently the fault of the exclusive devotees of the continental schools.

Another objection is that the writer in this analysis not only gives the principles, but the technics of his own system. We expect of course that every writer will have his own system, and will use that system in his criticism. But the exhibition of it in form with its nomenclature in so brief an introduction, strikes us as quite premature, especially as the entire section in which he discusses Aristotle, Kant, Cousin and himself occupies less than fifteen pages, not closely printed.

We suggest, also, that the preliminary classification of all systems as sensational, idealistic, skeptical, mystical and eclectic, is exposed to grave objections. We do not dispute the applicability of the terms as general designations to particular writers and classes of writers. The use of them for certain purposes, is in the highest degree convenient and commendable. But the fact is, that there are very many distinguished philosophers to whom these terms will in no exclusive sense apply. They cannot be truly said to be nothing but sensationalists or idealists. Locke and Descartes may serve as examples. Locke is far from being a sensationalist, and nothing more. Descartes is not simply an idealist.

The author uses these epithets in the most objectionable form. For he carries them through his entire work, and classifies the philosophers of each period under these several heads. The effect of this is to affix unjust and odious names to those who do not wholly deserve them, and to create a prejudice against the memory of those who deserve the highest honor from their fellow men. The author does not design to do injustice to any, we fully believe. He attempts to qualify and limit the effect of his unfavorable classification so far as it lies in his power. The name however will still adhere, and the writer will be viewed by the man who receives his impression from the historian alone, as one to whom the term applies. If he reads him for himself, the biassing influences of these original impressions will remain with him still.

We extend therefore our criticism from this classification, and apply it to the entire work. We venture to say, that it labors under the objection of hasty and vague generalization, involving in some cases an incorrect, and in others an obscure impression. We know that the brevity of such a work, seems to demand some general method like that which has been adopted. We are also aware that to go into a very minute detail and extended discussion in regard to partic-

ular opinions, is impossible. And yet it is true, that the effort to speak in the concrete rather than in the abstract, and in the particular rather than in the general, is greatly to be desired, and would have added to the interest and the authority of this volume. We cannot but think that the author has erred in this particular, from his deference to, or rather from his fondness for his continental favorites. Had he followed the sparkling homeliness of Reid, and the cautious exactness of Stewart, rather than the brilliant but sometimes obscure and sometimes hasty Cousin, he would have produced a work more congenial to the English tastes, and more in keeping with the ordinary tone of English literature.

The work will be most sought for, for its information in regard to the continental writers, particularly those of the German school. On no subject has the curiosity of Englishmen been more excited than upon this, and in respect to none has it been so difficult to satisfy this curiosity. The only full and critical accounts of these writers, have been accessible only through German and French writers, and these even are not common in this country; while a dry and formal exhibition of the technical terms in our own language, however useful to those who are masters of the system of which this is a synopsis, it will cast but little light on its true character, to one who appears as a first inquirer. The object of the author was to do more than give a dry detail of the principles and technics of these great German schools. It was to show how they have to do with the same problems of thought which have tried all philosophers from the first outset of their inquiries. To show also how one of these systems made way for the other, and to give an intelligible though brief account of the principles, in the language and by means of the terminology that is familiar to men of education. He does not indeed withhold the nomenclature peculiar to each individual philosopher. To do so would be absurd. But he does not confine himself to it with a dry and curt explanation, nor explain one term by another as dry and scholastic as itself.

If we are asked how far he has been successful in his aim to bring within the reach of his English readers an intelligible view of the German schools, we can answer thus far safely, that he has succeeded far better than any one who has preceded him, and in the case of some of them he has been highly successful. His exhibitions of the peculiarities of Fichte and Hegel are felicitous. Those of Kant and Schelling seemed to us not to be so thoroughly treated, though the difficulty is probably in the subject matter. It is however still a question whether any knowledge obtained from the most felicitous execution of a design, such as is contemplated by the author, can be relied

upon as being worth all that it seems to be, and whether one does not leave such an exhibition of the principles of any writer, thinking that he knows more than he does in fact. If he adopts his conclusions he will do it without knowing the grounds on which they rest, the processes by which the writer has been led to them, the objections which he has or has not successfully combatted, and the relations which his opinion holds to other truths and other interests. Or as is more likely to be the case with the American student, who shall read the summaries by our author of the principles of the German schools, he will be repelled by a barbarous nomenclature, and be quite satisfied that a scheme of principles so uncouth, can never give them any valuable light or discipline. We desire above all things, whether we meet a man as a partisan or an antagonist of any system of philosophy or theology, that he may not have derived all his knowledge of the system from any sketch of the heads of its opinions.

Besides the criticisms of Mr. Morell on the continental systems, both German and French, he has aimed to give a full notice of the English and Scotch. The leading philosophers from Bacon to the present time, all receive a share of his attention. They are of course criticised from his point of view, and judged by the standard of the eclectic school, and are classed according to the principles which we have indicated, but the spirit of the critic is always generous, and the tone is fair.

It would be gathered from a perusal of the contents and a glance at a few pages here and there, that this history is far more complete than any in the English language. Perhaps also it may be said to be more complete in its topics and in the extent of its range, than any other single history. It would be folly and ignorance to say or to think that in its notices of German philosophy it is as full as the work of Michelet, or that it gives so complete an exhibition of the French speculation as does Damiron; but it possesses the advantage of presenting the German, the French and the English philosophies side by side, and of showing to a certain extent the relations which they hold to each other.

The bibliographical value of the work, especially in the English portion of the history, is not inconsiderable. The manual of Tenneman may indicate the names of very many writers who are less known, but it does not give us that satisfaction furnished by the fuller notices of Morell, brief as they are. His incidental notices too of living writers in England, and of movements under the surface, here and there reveal to us a kind of knowledge which is most rarely gained from books.

The attitude of the author towards religion is uniformly respectful and reverent. He shows indeed a less intimate knowledge with the great theological writers of England than we should expect, and seems to be less conversant with its best treatises on the great questions which have been raised in respect to the defence of Christianity. But that he is a believer in some sense in the supernatural origin of Christianity, is sufficiently obvious by plain but not obtrusive intimations. He is also deeply and justly sensible of the relation of philosophy to religion, and he argues the question with fairness yet with boldness. That he should be obliged to argue it as he does, is somewhat humiliating to the good name of our mother-land. Whatever may be the prejudices against philosophy, of the religious or theological world in this country, and though they may be narrow and unreasonable enough, and extend more widely than we could desire, we are quite thankful that no writer with us, would be oppressed as Mr. Morell seems to be with the extent of the prejudices against philosophy which prevail in the religious world, and with the hopelessness of making an impression upon it by the clearest and most obvious considerations. We are quite certain that there is a very large class of the truly educated and best minds of this country, with whom the principles on this subject, which Mr. Morell finds it so necessary to reïterate, are received as axioms. It is with great pleasure that we notice this first production of an author who in his work presents so many claims to our kind and respectful regard, and who we are assured by those who know him, is all as a man, that he seems to be in his writings. The work eminently deserves, and we are confident will receive, an extensive and increasing circulation in this country. We are not certain but it will be valued more highly here than it has been at home, though it would seem that the interest of the English thinkers in "Speculative Philosophy," is decidedly advancing.

Sir William Hamilton's edition of the works of Reid is a production of the highest value, and will be sought for with great eagerness by all students in mental science. Those who have learned to esteem the rare erudition and the mental force of the editor from his occasional contributions in the Edinburgh Review, could have no other than the highest expectations from a formal critique by him of the works of the father of the Scotch philosophy. They would easily anticipate that the opinions of Reid would present numerous points of interest which could not but suggest notices of the great writers of France and Germany, and invite a formal review of the entire field of modern philosophy. They will not be disappointed on an actual in-

spection of the work. The completion of this criticism will challenge their admiration. First of all the writer is seen to be fully acquainted with the field by actual and familiar study of all of the recent writers. Next it is obvious that he does not despise them, but understands the import, the extent and the difficulties of the questions which have occupied their attention. What is best of all, he will feel that he is not mastered by them, but is the master of them all, for while he does justice to their truths, he detects their errors, and in appreciating and acknowledging their strength, he discerns and exposes their weakness. He is not dazzled by their splendid generalizations, nor imposed on by the apparent continuity of their logic, nor does he defer to their judgment as founded on their rarer opportunities or more extended erudition. Nor again does he yield to the natural, but still weak fondness, by which truth in a foreign dress is taken to be newer or more important than the same truth in a domestic garb; or by which an error is judged less weak or dangerous for the same reason. But as a man who is in earnest for the truth, who is master of all distinctions which any man can make, and can follow in processes however refined, where any man can lead; he grapples with any and all of their philosophers, and shows himself their equal.

The relations of Reid to Kant and his successors, as well as to Cousin and the other eclectics, are so intimate, we need not say, as very naturally to bring up their doctrines, for a distinct recognition and a constant reference and comparison. For Reid was as distinctly aware of the deficiencies in Locke as any of Locke's more recent opponents. His opposition to him, however, is quite unequal. At one time it is scientific; at another, it is only practical. On one occasion he subjects a doctrine to an acute and methodical analysis; on another, he arrests all analysis by a stubborn protest in behalf of a fact, leaving its elements unanalyzed and its methods unexplained. As a consequence, he has left much to do, for a disciple who follows him in the main principles of his philosophy. Besides, his reading was not so extensive, nor his analysis so exhausting, nor his method so logical, as not to leave much to be done, even in his own times, to develope fully and to vindicate entirely the principles of his system. And now that entire schools of philosophy have sprung up, exhausting in their reading, and logical even to excess in their methods of reasoning, it would seem that the expounder of a better system should be equal to them in learning, and equally skilled in the forms of logic. No one who has read Sir William Hamilton's criticism on Cousin can doubt the immense advantage which he can assert over every other critic of the French philosopher, in being the master of the same weapons with

the subject of his strictures. It is as obvious, that the great majority of English writers who have attempted to criticise the continental writers, show that they do not fully comprehend the subject of which they write, or at least do not comprehend the way in which these writers think they understand the subject. Hence, it has been almost universally true, that English criticisms are disregarded or despised on the continent, and an impassable gulf has seemed to be fixed between the schools of the continent and those of Great Britain. We say almost universally, for Hamilton is an illustrious exception. His critiques on Cousin as well as his other productions, have been felt and appreciated by Cousin and his disciples, and it is generally allowed by these latter, that he is in all points equal to their master, and worthy to stand at the head of a rival British school. His miscellaneous works have been translated into French and published at Paris. In addition to a familiar acquaintance with the modern schools, he has another advantage, of being equally at home with Aristotle. The Stagirite is his great master. A master whom he does not adore like the schoolmen, with a blind idolatry, but whom he honors by an intelligent appreciation. His references are frequent and natural. His commentators are also every day acquaintances, and the schoolmen no less familiar. Indeed we know not what writer gives more decided and marked indications of erudition, properly displayed, and yet turned to actual use in illustrating and enforcing principles that are profound and original, while yet they are clearly and strikingly stated. Of all this erudition, rare and massive as it is, he seems to be the master, and never to be over-burdened by its ponderous weight. Like Warburton, and unlike Parr, he wields the spear which is like a weaver's beam, as though it were a Parthian dart. It is true, the learning is sometimes a little disproportionate to the demand of the occasion, and the effect is a little laughable when the heavy spear is raised against a foe whom the dart would annihilate quite as certainly and far more gracefully. The style of the author we cannot compliment. It is cumbrous and awkward. His long familiarity with the peculiarly abstract terminology of logic, has made this as it would seem the most natural language by which to express his thoughts on all subjects; and to reduce everything to its most general and abstract conceptions, and to express them by the most attenuated phraseology, is as natural to him as it was with Dame Quickly, to speak of everything in the concrete. It requires a special training to feel at home with his language, and it assumes at times almost a barbarous aspect, which repels every one except the persevering inquirer. The earnest student will regard this, however, as of slight consequence, and will

cheerfully make all the effort that is required, in order to break through to the valuable thought that is concealed beneath the rough exterior.

The volume before us is, we regret to say, incomplete. It is abruptly closed at the 914th page, in the midst of an important note, and in the midst also of an unfinished sentence; the publisher we presume having become impatient of longer delay. The work is printed in double columns, in a style which is by no means equal to the merits of the work, and the proof reading is very carelessly done. These defects are hardly explained or justified by the cheapness of the work, and the desire to make it a text-book for classical use. Still less is the mechanical execution of the volume at all worthy of the value of its contents, and the deserved reputation of its editor. Surely the city and university of Edinburgh have too much reason to be proud of the name of their professor of logic, to say nothing of the honor of the founder of the Scottish school of philosophy, to be content with such an edition of the works of Reid, edited by the first of British metaphysicians.

The appearance of the volume is however of little consequence compared with the contents. These comprise first of all a full collection of the writings of Reid, with selections from his unpublished letters. Dugald Stewart's account of his life and writings is also prefixed. The contributions of the editor, consist first of all, of supplementary dissertations on distinct and important topics. These are appended to the writings of Reid, and they comprise nearly 200 closely printed pages. They are connected with Reid's writings by distinct and numerous references, and yet are an extended and complete discussion of separate and important topics. Note A is entitled, "On the philosophy of common sense; or, our primary beliefs considered as the ultimate criterion of truth." Note B is "Of presentative and representative knowledge." Note C is "On the various theories of external perception." Note D "Distinction of the primary and secondary qualities of body." D* "Perception proper and sensation proper." D** "Contribution towards a history of the doctrine of mental suggestion or association." D*** "Outline of a theory of mental reproduction, suggestion or association." In the midst of this note the volume terminates, and we are left to conjecture how many and what the remaining notes will be. It would seem, however, that they are to be a complete exhibition of the editor's views on the most important topics in psychology and metaphysics. These supplementary dissertations do not constitute the most important contributions of the editor. Equally interesting and valuable in our view, are the occa-

sional notes which appear on almost every page, of greater or less length. These are especially valuable from the fact, that they cast the light precisely on the spot where the light is needed, and also from the fact, that they are more happily conceived and expressed, than the more formal and extended dissertations at the end. We should be unwilling to spare either however, and we are disposed to complain only that the work is not finished. If it were complete, we should not hesitate to pronounce it one of the most important books of reference in the language, to the student in mental science. We trust it will not be long before the whole will be made accessible to the public. The appearance of such a book of itself constitutes an era in the history of British science, almost as remarkable and as worthy to be remembered, as that of Reid's original works. Certainly no work has appeared at any time since that period, which was fitted to make a stronger impression on the public mind, or to give a more decided direction to the habits of thinking, or to shape and fix the principles of scholars. We cannot but desire that this work shall be accessible to our American students. No writer in the English language, as we think, more richly deserves, and will more amply repay a thorough study, than Dr. Reid, by himself. Certainly Dr. Reid, as edited by Sir William Hamilton, is eminently worthy of the most faithful attention. The appearance of this work at this time is particularly auspicious. The dazzling influence which attended the first introduction of the French and German philosophers to our American scholars, has given way to a more sober desire, thoroughly and critically to scan their merits. The imposing effect, from novel phraseology and high-sounding nomenclature and lofty assumption, has been gradually losing its charms. The minds of the studious seem to be in a collapsed condition consequent to the excitement which attended the giving up an implicit attachment to their old favorites, and the disappointment at not being fully satisfied with the newer. A general desire and expectation seems to be cherished, of a system which shall be sober and rational, while yet it shall not be superficial nor sensual,—a system which shall neither creep on the earth, nor be lost in the clouds, but which shall stand firmly upon the one while yet its eye shall clearly gaze into the mysteries of the other, and so be true to man's nature, and the laws of man's being. No writer is better fitted to meet this desire, or to satisfy these longings than Reid, and none will be found to convey more truth in an unpretending way or to satisfy more questions and to solve more problems, without seeming to promise to do either. Whatever his deficiencies might have been, either in his

principles or their adaptation to modern readers, these are abundantly supplied by his accomplished editor.

Should this work be given to the American public in a reprint, as we trust will be the case, we desire first of all to see it published in a form more convenient and attractive than is that of the Edinburgh edition. We hope also that it may be accompanied by a translation of the fragments of Royer Collard's lectures, collected and appended by Jouffroy to his translation of Reid's works. These lectures are so instructive a comment and expansion of Reid's system, that they ought not to be withheld from the mass of English readers. Perhaps also they should be accompanied by the preface of Jouffroy to the same edition of Reid. Both these would show how Reid was transplanted into France, and constituted the influence and began the impulses which have resulted in the better French philosophy of the present day. In this connection we ought not to omit to mention that the editor of the work has very appropriately dedicated it to Victor Cousin, "not only in token of the editor's admiration of the first philosopher of France, but, as a tribute due appropriately and preëminently to the statesman through whom Scotland has been again united intellectually to her old political ally, and the author's writings, (the best result of Scottish speculation) made the basis of academical instruction in philosophy, throughout the central nation of Europe."

The Dictionary of the Philosophical Sciences, is the last of the three works which we propose to notice. It is issued by an association of professors of philosophy, of the school of Cousin. The attention of the numerous disciples of this school has been of late much directed to historical and critical inquiries and the natural result of investigations of this sort, by a sufficient number of men of a common way of thinking, is the publication of an encyclopedia or critical dictionary. It is issued in numbers or *livraisons*, each containing more than 300 large and closely printed pages, which are sold in Paris at five francs. Two of these constitute a volume; and four volumes will complete the work. The initials of the writer are subjoined to each article, and a list of the writers' names in full accompanies each volume. The work is edited by Franck, a member of the institute and associate professor of philosophy, in the faculty of letters at Paris. The principles of the work are given at some length in the preface. They are in the main the principles of the eclectic school, though they are expressed in language and by terms to which the disciples of the English philosophy of common sense and of faith, would make little objection. This dictionary differs from the German encyclopaedia of Krug in being

more exclusively and appropriately metaphysical in its topics, and it also gives fuller notices of French and English writers and discussions. It has the advantage also of being free from the peculiar technology and nomenclature which the German writers always adopt, whether they criticise a German, a French, or an English writer. It brings down the knowledge of these sciences to a recent date. The several topics treated of are described in the preface, as the following: "1. Philosophy properly so called. 2. The history of philosophy with a criticism, or at least an impartial judgment, of all the opinions and systems which philosophy spreads out before us. 3. The biography of all the philosophers of any importance, confined within such limits, as to conduce to the knowledge of their opinions and to the general history of the science. We need not add that this portion of our labor does not concern the living. 4. Philosophical bibliography arranged in such a way, that at the conclusion of every article, there may be found a list of all the works which relate to that subject, or of all the writings of the philosopher whose life and opinions have been considered. 5. The definition of every philosophical term, to whatsoever system it may belong; whether or not it has been retained in use. Each of these definitions is in some sort, the history of the word of which it proposes to explain the signification. It takes it at its origin; it follows it through all the schools which have adopted it in succession, and have turned it to their own use. Thus it is that the history of words is inseparable from the history of ideas. This part of our work, though obviously the most humble, is not perhaps the least useful. It might contribute if prosecuted by hands more skilful than ours, to establish in philosophy at least a unity of language." The subjects are arranged in the alphabetic order. The titles under the letter B, are the following: Baader, Bacon (Roger and Francis), Barclay, Bardili, Bassus Aufidius, Baumeister, Baumgarten (A. G.), Bayer, Bayle, Beattie, Beautiful the idea of, Beausobre (Isaac and Louis), Beccaria, Beck, Becker (Balthazar and Rodolfus), Bede, Bendavid, Bentham, Bérard, Bérenger (of Tours and of Poitiers) Berg, Berger (J. E. de. and J. G. E.), Bergier, Bérigard, Bergk, Berkeley, Bernard of Chartres, Bessarion, Bias, Bichat, Biel, The supreme good, (*Bien, Souverain Bien*), Bilfinger, Bion, Bodin or Bodinus, Boëce or Boëthius, Boehme (Jacob and C. F.), Boëthius (Daniel), Boëthus, Bolingbroke, Bonald, Bonaventura St., Bonnet, Bonstetten, Born, Boscovich, Bossuet, Buddhism, Boulainvilliers, Boursier, Bouterweck, Bredenburg, Broussais, Brown (Peter and Thomas) Bruce, Brucker, Bruno, Bryson, Buddeus, Buffier, Buhle, Buonafede, Buridan, Burke, Burlamaqui, Burleigh, Butler. The letter B, we should not expect

would be one of the most promising, but it will be seen from these titles, that the plan of the dictionary is truly liberal.

The tone of the dictionary is believing and elevated. Its influence is favorable to morality, to conservative yet liberal political views, and to religious faith. The relations of the eclectic school to Christianity and to Christian theology, are however somewhat singular, and it is worthy a serious consideration as illustrating the type of Christianity which prevails in France, and the almost necessary influence of the Romish church on the reflecting and inquiring minds among its men of education. The philosophers of the eclectic school as inquirers after truth, are serious and believing, and in some sense of the word, are religious. They are serious and believing, inasmuch as they recognize with distinct acknowledgement the moral and religious nature of man, and the moral administration of God as adapted to this nature. Christianity as a system of religious truth, and as breathing the spirit of duty and of love, they in some sense acknowledge to be divine. Many or most of them in their external profession, may be very good Catholics. But they find themselves in a perpetual warfare with the church. In this dictionary, the theological spirit is perpetually spoken of as a necessary antagonist of the philosophical. Christianity is recognized as being coincident with the indications and conclusions of philosophy, but the Christian theology of the church is never there recognized. It is never hinted, much less is it asserted, that the principles of theology ought to be as truly harmonious with the deductions of true science as the foundations of natural religion. Nay, the contrary seems to be continually implied. What harmony can there be between faith and science, if the only condition of this peace shall be a general armistice with no definite and well defined concord. What union between the thinking philosopher and believing Christian, if it be necessary that the philosopher when he thinks should forget the Christian when he believes, and the Christian just so far as he believes, must be untrue to the philosopher when he reflects. The cause of this disunion and weakness is too obvious to require an explanation. It is as clear as the sunlight that it lies in the attitude in which the Romish church teaches the truths of Christianity and the grounds on which it rests its claims. Its sad and disastrous consequence to the best minds of the nation, must continue so long as science and Christian theology shall maintain their present relative position. It is mournful to think, that while the philosophical spirit of the people is so hopeful, neither Romanism nor Protestantism seem to understand its condition nor to be able to meet its wants. It would seem that if a truly Christian philosophy could be grafted upon this promising stock, an entire change

might be effected in the thinking mind of the nation. But from whence this Christian philosophy is to come, is more than we can predict.

The difference between France and either Germany or England in this respect is striking, with all the monstrous errors of Germany. It is still a perpetual problem with the newest philosophy, to give a philosophical solution of the doctrines of Christianity. The solution may be more inexplicable than the difficulty left unsolved, but the attempt to make it, argues the conviction that scientific and Christian truth ought to be harmonious. In England, philosophy has endeavored to follow and to keep pace with theology, though it must be confessed it has too often been "haud passibus aequis." But in England it has always been believed that theology and philosophy should move with even pace in the same harmonious rounds, and should together manifest the glory of the God who is truth and love. That this ideal harmony should be fully realized, is the aim and effort of every truly Christian philosopher.

ARTICLE VII.

JEROME AND HIS TIMES.

By Rev. Samuel Osgood, Providence, R I.

1. *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Stridonensis, Presbyteri Opera. Studio ac Labore Domini Johannis Martianay, Presbyteri et Monachi Ordinis S. Benedicti è Congregatione S. Mauri, Parisiis,* MDCXIII —MDCCVI.
   Works of St. Eusebius Jerome of Stridon, Presbyter. Edited by John Martianay, Presbyter, and Monk of the Benedictine Order of the Congregation of St. Maur. In five Volumes, folio.
2. *Histoire de Saint Jerome, Perè de L'Eglise, au IV^e^ Siecle; Sa Vie, Ses Ecrits et Ses Doctrines, par F. Z. Collombet. Paris,* 1844.
   History of St. Jerome, Father of the church in the Fourth Century; his Life; his Writings and his Doctrines. In two volumes, 8vo. *By F. Z. Collombet.*

Rich as was the church of the fourth century in illustrious men who adorned imposing office with brilliant abilities; in princes like

the imperial convert Constantine who begun, and the more consistent Theodosius, who completed the union of the church and State; in prelates indomitable as Athanasius, profound as Augustine, eloquent as Gregory and Chrysostom, and commanding as Ambrose and Basil; it is not to any of these titled dignitaries that Christendom in ages since has paid her most frequent honors. The Roman church, at least, has passed over this majestic array of princes and prelates with comparative indifference, and reserved her brightest aureola for an untitled scholar, who shrank alike from courts and councils, who refused the proffered mitre, and forbore to exercise even the office of priest. Whom can we mean but Jerome the monk of Bethlehem? As a devotee he has perhaps been more honored by Catholics than any saint upon the calendar who has lived since the apostolic times, whilst as a scholar he has been ranked by all parties as chief in the ancient church. His spirit has haunted the visions of monks and nuns, and the imaginations of painters and sculptors. His kneeling form meets us in the gorgeous windows of the middle age cathedrals, and in the rich miniatures of illuminated manuscripts. Who has not heard of the picture, in the Vatican, of the Last Communion of St. Jerome, and who would undertake to complete the catalogue of similar works or name the artists among whom Domenichino and the Caracci have taken the lead?

It is not merely from the prostrate devotee of the papal ages, that the monk of Bethlehem has received such honors. His letters and tracts were among the first to receive the stamp of the printing-press,[1] and in their Gothic type are now among the most precious specimens in antiquarian collections. No fewer than eight editions of his entire works have been published, the first of which appeared at Basle (1516—1520) under the charge of the celebrated Erasmus, and the last of which is from the Paris press with ink as yet scarcely dry. As an interpreter and translator of Scripture, his name stands chief of the fathers in the preface of the translators of our approved English Bible. As great proof of his literary importance may be found in the ponderous volume that Le Clerc wrote in question of his scholarship, as in the petulant and tiresome folios that Martianay and his fellows sent forth in his defence. The lighter literature of a later day has not forgotten the saint. He appears conspicuous in the meditations of Zimmermann and the fancies of Chateaubriand, whilst in the gayest city in the world

[1] In the library of Harvard University we find an edition of his epistles which, although without date, according to Brunet's Manual must have been printed as early as 1469, and an edition of his tract against Jovinian that bears the date of 1474.

several selections from his works have been recently published in a popular form, and L. Aimé-Martin[1] ranks with Collombet[2] among his eulogists.

We too are much interested in Jerome. For his monkish superstition we of course have little love, nor can we find much that is Christlike in the temper with which he met the adversaries of his creed. We are interested in him as the best scholar of the ancient church. We like to read him because his works are the best index of the state of learning in his time, and moreover the most faithful mirror of the opinions, manners and morals of his age. Recluse as he generally was, he kept up a minute acquaintance with contemporary events and characters. His nervous and irascible nature never failed to expose every trouble that annoyed him. His peculiar temperament reveals the presence of every current literary and religious influence, as faithfully as the torsion balance measures the minute electric forces. If any new opinion were started he could never be easy until he lifted his pen in the agitation. Much as we may value the homilies of Chrysostom for shedding light upon the manners and morals of the time, we may prize more the letters of Jerome, since these instead of being busied chiefly with the affairs of single cities like Antioch or Constantinople, deal with all Christendom, and reflect every shade of the prevalent faith and practice. This indefatigable letter writer kept a kind of central post-office at Bethlehem, and he was of such a nature that of everything that interested him whether in his own studies or in current events he must straightway write to some of his correspondents. Every literary undertaking, however grave, gave occasion for his epistolary gift. His elaborate criticisms were written in the form of letters, and in the prefaces to his commentaries whether upon prophet or evangelist, he is sure to have a fling at some crying evil of the day.

In the cursory sketch which we propose to give of the life and labors of this most learned of the Christian fathers, although we do not of course presume to add anything to the knowledge of those who are acquainted with the recent foreign contributions to ecclesiastical history, we are safe in saying, that with the aids that are at hand, nothing but incorrigible stupidity, can prevent a review from giving a more satisfactory survey of the subject than any that is offered by our current church histories. In reference to Jerome, our English historians are wretchedly meagre. The most racy of his German biographers ends his narrative with the declaration that the best that has been done in

[1] Oeuvres Choisies. 10 vols. in 8vo.

[2] Oeuvres Mystiques. 1 vol. grand in 8vo.

this field serves rather to excite than to satisfy the desire for a more comprehensive portraiture of the Saint and his times. This want of course we may not hope to fill. It is enough to try to make out our sketch from the best authorities at hand, with such study of the works of Jerome himself as we have been able to make.

By universal consent the richest materials are furnished from the saint's own pages. The chief office of the editor and biographer indeed consists in correcting the text and in determining the dates of events and the connection of passages, so as to derive from the author himself a consistent protrait and harmonious story. Of the three editions which separately or collectively have been the basis of all the others, the chief two, those of Erasmus and Martianay are before us, whilst we are reconciled to the absence of that of Vallarsi (Verona, 1734—1742) from the fact that Schroeckh so fully defines its characteristic, and Collombet has based upon its principles his entire work. Of the almost score of Lives of Jerome that are extant, we need not give even the names. Tillemont and Martianay deserve the chief place on the list, the former from the careful criticism which he applies to the works and life of the saint, an application not always ungrateful to his Jansenist scruples—the latter from his indefatigable labor and devoted partizanship. If Vallarsi has in some respects surpassed them both, especially in a more accurate chronological arrangement of Jerome's letters, it is to be remembered how much he depended upon the labors of his predecessors, and that he has builded upon their foundation. Of the work of Dolci (Ancona, 1750) and that of Engelstoft (Copenh. 1797), we may say with Collombet, that they have not reached us. As to the volumes of Collombet himself, they cannot be read without pleasure, and profit, much as the constant tone of eulogy may offend us, and distasteful as the ornate style and sometimes bombastic rhetoric may occasionally be. The work has evidently been prepared with considerable study and great ambition, and comes to us with the sanction of a brief from the late pope, and a dedication to a cardinal as noted as De Bonald. It is of considerable service in enabling us to judge of the Saint in connection with his times, although the protestant reader is often repelled by the papal hue in which the enthusiastic Frenchman invests the Christendom of the fourth century. The whole of the two volumes, however, fails to give so good or at least so definite an idea of the general subject as the half volume of Schroeckh[1] in his history, and the twenty quarto pages by Von Cölln in the Encyclopaedia of Ersch and Gruber (Leipsic, 1831),—an article admirable for its learning, compactness and point, tainted though it may be with

[1] Christliche Kirchengeschichte, T. XL. Leipzig, 1794, pp. 1—239.

a little of Gibbon's sarcasm. Of Neander's labors in this department, we need not speak at length. Although far from being full enough to meet our wants, his observations are distinguished by his usual learning, freedom and good sense. It is enough to say of the biography by the Jesuit, John Stilling,[1] which although by no means of recent date came latest to hand, that it is an unqualified and extravagant eulogium, and shows its character very well from the fact that about thirty of its folio pages are devoted to the investigation of the relics of the Saint, and other like matters connected with his posthumous marvels. Although far better tempered than Martianay, and remarkably laborious in historical details, Stilling shares something of the Benedictine editor's disposition, and adds one to the many instances in which the irascible monk has innoculated his champions with the virus of his own temper. But we must not linger any longer upon these preliminaries.

In the middle of the fourth century, a young Illyrian, who had already exhausted the literary privileges of his provincial home, in company with a schoolmate of like age, turned towards Rome. He came to enjoy the instructions of the celebrated teachers who held their schools in the imperial city. Judging from his own allusions, we cannot form a very favorable idea of his native place. The people of Stridon were gluttonous and avaricious, whilst the bishop Lupicinus was a pastor not unlike his flock. The student's childhood had been under the tuition of a pedagogue who drilled him in the rudiments so severely that, using an epithet from Horace, he spoke of him in after years as the savage Orbilius. He was born of Christian parents, probably in affluent circumstances, and left home with favorable dispositions towards Christianity, although without any very decided personal convictions. Such was the young Illyrian, who came to Rome to enjoy the learning of her noted schools. He thought quite as little as his teacher Donatus how soon the tables would be turned, and Rome would look to this pilgrim to her literary shrine as her own most learned teacher, and that after ages would regard Eusebius Jerome as the most illustrious scholar of the Latin church.

The year of his arrival at Rome is not ascertained. It is very clear, however, that he was there in A. D. 363, at the time of the death of the emperor Julian. What was then his age is a much controverted question, since his birth has been placed at dates as widely apart as 329 and 346. He has been supposed by most of his earlier biographers, who have followed the ancient chronicle of Prosper, to have been born

[1] Acta Sanctorum. Septemb. Tom. VIII. pp 418—688. Antwerp 1762. fol. Copy in Library of Harvard University.

in 331, although this date is not consistent with the same writer's subsequent statement that Jerome died in 420 at the age of 91.[1] The saint, moreover, speaks of his being a mere boy at the time of Julian's death, and from this and other equivalent expressions, Baronius was led to fix the date at 342, and has had the approbation of Dupin, Tillemont, Dolci and Lardner. Vallarsi goes still further, and fixes upon the year 346, and is followed in this opinion by Collombet. As our own patience has been well nigh exhausted in following Stilling through his elaborate vindication of the earlier date in reply to the six or seven arguments of Baronius and his followers, we will not test the temper of our readers by rehearsing the controversy. The Jesuit certainly makes out a very good case, and proves that Jerome at least might call himself a boy at any period without implying anything more, than that he was then a pupil of his masters or a mere tyro in learning. Schroeckh, who has gone into the particulars of the controversy, is quite satisfied with Stilling's argument, and thinks it a sufficient refutation of the later date, that about the year 403, Jerome addressed Augustine as his son, an epithet that would not be appropriate if the former was but in his sixtieth year, since the latter was certainly almost fifty. This point, however, is by no means satisfactory, since ten years of seniority might give great venerableness to one, who like Jerome, had hastened old age by his austerities, and who from his ghostly sanctity might, as has sometimes been the habit of spiritual directors, address even his seniors as his children.

But, however this controversy as to the saint's birth may be decided, it is beyond question that in 363 he was in Rome. At that time the condition of the empire was peculiar, and the church on the eve of her most brilliant period. Julian had died, and with him died the enterprise of supplanting the doctrines of Christ by the ethics of Antoninus, and substituting for Christianity a splendid but visionary eclecticism of philosophical deism, nature-worship and vulgar paganism. The apostate died; under the auspices of Jovian the Labarum of Constantine again glittered at the head of the imperial legions, and in the hearing of the young Illyrian the pagans expressed their dismay at the summary vengeance taken by the Christian God upon the restorer of the ancient altars, and their wonder that he could be called patient and long suffering. But yet for many years the old religion retained its temples and pageants. Pontiffs, augurs, vestals, flamens, with all their ancient retinue, still exercised their offices, and by their regular succession connected the Porte of Constantine and Jovian

[1] This incongruity is regarded by Stilling as coming from an error of the pen, which led the transcribers to write Undenonagesimo, XCI.

with the Rome of Numa. But it could not escape a mind so sagacious as Jerome's, and one so tremulously sensitive to every popular movement, that a power was at work in the empire, that must overthrow the pagan idols, and set up the cross on the very altar of victory. More than four hundred temples or chapels still remained to satisfy the superstition of the people; yet there were a few far less conspicuous edifices which were resorted to with a kind of reverence unknown to the votaries of Jupiter or Mars. The Basilica of the Lateran and that of St. Peter with others of like stamp were frequented by the followers of the cross, and already the Christian bishops began to rival the pagan pontiffs in the splendor of their array. The great prelates of the East and the West, who were to make the close of the century so brilliant in the Christian annals, had not yet appeared. The veteran Athanasius occupied the most conspicuous place among the churches, and under the patronage of Jovian, had promise of passing the remainder of his troubled life in dignity and peace.

How Jerome passed his student years at Rome, he has pretty fully disclosed. He was a close student, somewhat of a man of pleasure, and occasionally he was seized with the impulses of a devotee. He learned grammar of Donatus the commentator upon Terence, and rhetoric probably of Victorinus who was celebrated for the brilliancy of his school and for the notoriety of his conversion. Jerome was ambitious of literary name—made himself very familiar with the Roman and probably somewhat with the Greek literature, and not content with the instructions of the lecture-room, frequented the courts of law to take practical lessons in logic and oratory. So strong was the impression left upon him by the studies of this period, that in old age they haunted his dreams, and the ghostly monk seemed to himself to be listening to rival pleaders, or to be declaiming before his master. He made a point of gathering a library at Rome, and thus unconsciously to himself was providing for his solitary years the companionship of the choice spirits of the classic world.

Although far from being strict in his habits, he loved to frequent the places in Rome that had been hallowed by the events of the martyr-age. He visited the sepulchres of the apostles and martyrs. It was a favorite habit with him to take a few companions, and on Sundays go down into the crypts of the catacombs, and wander in the subterranean gloom among the monuments of that solemn cemetery. There rambling, now spelling out the inscriptions on the tombs, and now quoting some line of Virgil as the darkness reminded him of the poet's Avernus, this Sunday loiterer had then within him the elements of character that were to give him such a name as the monk and

scholar among the Christian fathers. Yet he had no such sympathy with those dark retreats as to destroy his zest for the gaieties of the capital. He lived very freely, and with all his subsequent reverence for chastity, and contempt even for lawful marriage, he lays no claim to the credit of having never left the path of virtue. He allows that he could not well resist temptation, and that in youth he was as emulous in taking the lead in pleasure as afterwards in devotion. He laid claim by a singular figure of speech to the crown of virginity because in his soul he honored the virtue the more from not possessing it himself.[1]

At Rome Jerome received baptism. But whether this took place before or after his journey to Gaul, it is very certain that during that journey his strongest convictions were felt, and the purpose was formed that shaped his whole subsequent life. It was in the city of Treves, that he first resolved to devote himself to Christ, and formed with his companion and countryman Bonosus, the plan of an ascetic life. He evidently carried with him in his journey at the outset a decided taste for Christian studies, as he busied himself with the Christian literature of Gaul, and copied for his friend Rufinus the work of Hilary of Poictiers upon Synods, and also his Exposition of the Psalms. It is not strange, that on the banks of the Rhine among a semi-barbarous people, he should view life and the world far otherwise than in the gay metropolis, look upon his past history in a far graver spirit, and be led, moreover, to a better understanding of the genius of that church which was to restore the falling majesty of Rome, and bring into prostrate reverence the pride of those three nations who were preparing to overthrow the eternal city. It is a coincidence worthy of being mentioned, that the see of Arnoldi, bishop of Treves, the champion of the holy coat that has so lately convulsed Germany, should be in the city in which Jerome, the father of Romish monasticism and relic worship, met with the impressions that made him what he became. Truly the nineteenth century is not wholly different from the fourth. Nay, we have serious doubts whether Jerome, in his most erratic moods, would ever have dared to undertake the enterprise of the holy coat.

The exact extent of his travels in Gaul, a country with whose people he had much subsequent intercourse and great sympathy, we do not know. He probably went as far as the western coast and looked towards Britain and that far distant continent, that was not for ages to see the light of Christianity. After his return he spent some time in the famous city of Aquileia, not far distant from his own native place, and lived upon

[1] Epist. XXX. p. 242. T. IV. Martianay.

terms of intimate friendship with a circle of Christian friends, among whom were the priest Rufinus, afterwards his enemy, and Chromatius afterwards bishop of the city, and other clergy and monks. From this place he wrote probably the first letter that has reached us, and related to a friend the particulars of a strange occurrence at Vercella in the neighborhood, where an innocent woman was kept alive by a miracle after having received seven blows from the sword of the executioner. This letter may have been the cause of his flight which soon followed, since his version of the affair must have reflected severely upon the conduct of the civil tribunal. But whatever the cause, whether political troubles, family embarrassments, or, as the less believing suspect, the heat of his own passions, "a storm" came over him, and he was obliged to flee. In company with his friends Evagrius and Innocentius, and not forgetting his precious library, he turned his face towards the East to visit the regions for which his heart had many a time yearned. It was about the year 372, that he undertook this adventurous journey, and traversing Thrace, Pontus, Bithynia, Galatia, Cappadocia, Cilicia, he arrived at last at Antioch and ere long sought a solitude in the Syrian desert. While at Antioch, he was seized with severe sickness and in addition to his personal sufferings was grieved to the heart by the death of his friend Innocentius. It was probably at this time that he had that vision of judgment against the heathen classics which he describes in one of his letters to Eustochium, and in which he heard himself condemned by the judge as a mere Ciceronian and no Christian, and sought to escape the sentence by promising to abjure heathen literature forever. A dream like this was very likely to haunt the fevered hours of an invalid such as he was, and indicated very plainly the state of mind that led him to seek for a retreat among the monks of Chalcis.

But if the recluse had indulged in roseate fancies of solitary life he was destined to be grievously disappointed. He had frequent occasion to remember the remark of Horace, that they who cross seas are far from changing their dispositions with their abode. He found, that the retirement of the desert gave him no safe-guard from temptation. In the midst of his vigils and fastings, his imagination would steal away and revel in visions of Rome, its beauties and refinements. He suffered sadly alike in health and spirits. But in study he soon found the solace that could alleviate if not remove his desolation. As the world in which he had moved was hid from his sight, the realm of literature opened upon him with new brightness. While at Antioch he had informed himself of the system of Apollinarius of Laodicea, so celebrated for his skill in interpreting Scripture and for his peculiar

view of the nature of Christ; and had thus acquired important aids in the science of biblical interpretation. Even before retiring to the desert, he had attempted a commentary upon the book of Obadiah, a work whose loss is not much to be deplored, since in the preface to his subsequent commentary upon the same book, he speaks of it contemptuously as a token of his youthful ignorance and specimen of vain allegorizing.

His desire to interpret the sacred books led him to feel the want of knowledge of the Hebrew tongue. To meet this want, and at the same time aid him in subduing his fiery nature, he put himself under the instruction of a converted Jew and studied the Hebrew and probably Chaldee. He evidently thought it no little mortification for one so familiar with Cicero and Quintilian and Pliny to occupy his mind with a language so harsh and inflated.[1] But what was first a sacrifice became in time his delight, and the recluse soon grew more proud of his Hebrew than of any branch of learning, glorying as much on mortifying his classic tastes by this new study as in mortifying his flesh by fastings and vigils. His letters are rich in pictures of his hermit life. He appears to have gained a subsistence by the labor of his own hands, and to have passed his days in toil, study and devotion. At this time he probably wrote his eloquent, although extravagant history of Paulus, the first hermit. But fond as he was of study and determined as he had been to shut out the world and its agitations, he gave constant proof that he was still like other men, and could not be indifferent to the current of events. At first declaring that he had lost all knowledge of the affairs of his own country, and did not even know that it was in existence, he soon engaged in a close correspondence with his former friends in the West; now requesting that his sister, who had recovered from a sad fall from virtue, might be encouraged in the path of rectitude; now asking for theological books and again offering to spare manuscript copies, versions and explanations of the Scriptures from his own collection.

But the solitary had not yet so schooled his mind as to be long content to hold intercourse through the medium of letters. He was drawn into controversy that drew him from his retreat. Four rival bishops laid claim to the possession of the see of Antioch. Of course Jerome had no thought of favoring the claims of the Arian Euzoius or the latitudinarian Vitalis. His choice must lie between the two catholics, Meletius and Paulinus. Meletius was obviously the legitimate bishop, and had such defenders as Basil and Chrysostom. But Paulinus had

[1] "Stridentia anhelantiaque verba." Epistl. XCV. Ad Rusticum, p. 774. Martianay, I. IV.

the countenance of Athanasius and pope Damasus, and his cause triumphed alike by the posture of the rival factions and the connection of the controversy with a dispute as to the words most fit to be employed in defining the Trinity,—a dispute that soon exceeded in violence and extent the original controversy. Jerome was at first evidently at a loss what side to take in the conflict, and various causes increased his perplexity. He was no metaphysician and was almost crazed by the questions that were put to him by the monks who came to his cell to learn his mind as to the use of the word 'hypostases.' It was at once following his own inclinations and relieving himself of personal responsibility to appeal to Damasus of Rome, which he did in a letter not to be surpassed in ambitious rhetoric and servile adulation. What answer Damasus returned to this and a second similar letter, we do not know. But we soon find Jerome at Antioch upon intimate terms with Paulinus, and receiving ordination as presbyter at his hands. This was in the year 378 or 379. Instead of being weary of controversy and demanding as he had threatened to do the right of utter solitude in the desert, he engaged still more in the affairs of the church, and soon sent forth a treatise upon the Luciferian controversy in which he speaks in a tone of unusual mildness, and repudiates the doctrine that the bishops of the Arians, after renouncing their heretical connection, should not be recognized as bishops, and that the converts from Arianism should be re-baptized. The saint showed some humor in styling Hilary, the deacon who advocated the re-baptism of all converted heretics, the 'Deucalion of the world.'

But the controversialist was not so absorbed in these disputes as to forget the claims of the scholar, and Jerome sought the privileges of the brilliant schools of Constantinople and the countenance of Gregory its eloquent and learned bishop. Here he studied closely the Greek language with which before he seems to have been but partially acquainted, although we can by no means favor the idea sanctioned by Rufinus that he knew nothing of Greek while pursuing his studies at Rome. It was well for him to acquaint himself with the Byzantian literature, especially its method of interpretation, and thus enlarge even if by the too rhetorical and *Origenizing* method of Gregory, the rules which he had learned in the more liberal and practical school of Antioch. Yet he was too good a critic to be blinded by the glitter even of Gregory's eloquence into acquiescence with his ideas, and somewhat slily remarks that an ignorant audience, such as listened to the prelate's expositions, was not by any means the best test or school of biblical criticism. From Gregory however he acknowledged that he received important aids. How could a mind so susceptible as his

be otherwise than quickened and enlarged by the society of perhaps the most accomplished bishop of his day, at once poet, orator and theologian, imbued with classic knowledge gained at Athens in company with the noted Julian, and surpassed in eloquence only by his successor Chrysostom?

Although so long an inhabitant of the East, Jerome was at heart, a Roman, and labored for the literature of the Latin church by enriching it with translations of the most approved works from the Greek. He translated and enlarged the Chronicles of Eusebius; and showed how fully he began to appreciate the services of the great scholar, whom he alone was to surpass, by his translation of the homilies of Origen upon Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Yet then, so long before his conflict with the Origenists, he showed that he was no blind follower of the method of him whom he pronounced as second only to the Apostles, by openly departing from some of his criticisms. At the same time we are not disposed to regard the instance of his independence so frequently alleged, his criticism upon the vision of Seraphim in Isaiah, as an improvement upon the allegorical fancies of the great Alexandrian.

Once more the scholar was called away from his books to mingle in the agitations of the times. In 381, Meletius died at Antioch, and his partisans instead of recognizing the legitimacy of Paulinus appointed Flavianus his successor. The old dispute was renewed, appeal was made to a Roman synod, to which Paulinus went, followed by his friends Epiphanius and Jerome. The decision of this synod had little effect in settling the controversy in question, but its session resulted in no small advantage to Jerome. From his acquaintance with affairs at Antioch, he was appointed secretary and adviser of Damasus, and in this capacity displayed such learning and ability as to be employed in far more ambitious literary labors. He was often consulted upon questions of exegesis, and at the request of Damasus, began to translate the work of the Alexandrian catechist Didymus upon the Holy Spirit. We cannot much admire the manner in which he solved some of the Roman father's critical problems. Take for example the parable of the prodigal son. Something more than Greek and Hebrew was wanting to save him from the folly of regarding the two sons as the two nations, the Jews and the Heathen, and finding minute historical parallels for every feature of our Saviour's touching narrative. He still cherished his taste for Origen, and at Rome translated two of his homilies upon the Canticles. In a more arduous labor however he was now to be engrossed.

The Western Church possessed no authorized version of the New

Testament, but was obliged to depend upon divers anonymous translations which varied as much in sense as in phraseology. In public worship and in every controverted question, these varieties were very troublesome, and Damasus was desirous of having an approved version made from the original Greek. Jerome was called to the task and executed it most faithfully by a careful comparison of the current versions with one another and the original. He first translated the four gospels, and sent them forth with a preface to Damasus, and tables and marginal notes for the better understanding of the parallel passages. He went on with his undertaking, and labored upon the remaining books of the New Testament. He also corrected the old Latin version of the Psalter by the Septuagint, and busied himself with comparing the Greek version of Aquila with the Hebrew text. This first revision of the Bible was subsequently completed in the East. The only portions of it now extant are the Psalms, Job, and the New Testament.[1]

But the scholar was still at heart the monk, and Rome was to feel the influence of his asceticism as well as of his learning. The strictness of his life made him very conspicuous in a capital whose clergy already began to revel in all the luxuries of the world, and it was soon seen that the ascetic student was as little disposed to keep his austerity as his learning to himself. He conducted himself in such a way as to provoke the worldly, astonish the moderate, and awe the devout. The views which Athanasius had brought with him from the East in his journey to Rome, found far more followers when advocated by the eloquent scholar than by the stern dogmatist. He scandalized a large party of the clergy by his denunciation of their laxity, and drew upon him the attention of society at large by the sensation which he created among the Roman ladies. Strange it is, yet by no means unaccountable, that among the rich and privileged there have always been found those who are most earnest in condemning the vanities of the world, and most ready to listen to the praises of solitude and renunciation. From the more favored classes asceticism has derived its most devoted champions, its Basil, Benedict, Bernard, Dominic, Francis, Catherine of Genoa, Theresa, and a multitude of the same high mark. The reason is obvious; they who have tasted the pleasures of the world are more likely to feel their unsatisfactory character, than they who have seen them only in the enchantments of distance; and, moreover, the refinement of cultivated society is apt to bring with it sensibilities that subject their possessors to disappointment, life-weariness or yearning for retirement. It was among the courtly circles of Rome, that the accomplished monk of Syria found

[1] Martianay, T. I. p. 1185.

most willing and enthusiastic listeners. Several of the most distinguished widows and maidens resigned themselves wholly to his direction. Thus the monastic spirit took its strongest hold in Rome at a time when, under the auspices of Theodosius, the Christian church was about to wear its most brilliant secular honors, and to open even to worldly ambition the path of ecclesiastical preferment. By his pen as shown in his reply to Helvidius on the perpetual Virginity of the Blessed Mary, and by his conversation as many a Roman household proved, Jerome contended for the sanctity of celibacy and the worth of the ascetic life. Marcella, a rich and gifted widow, who had previously led a very devout life, was first to ask the monk's counsel in the study of the Scriptures, and offered the use of her stately palace on the Aventine for the re-unions of the pious circle that gathered around her. But it was not with Marcella and her mother Albina, devoted though they were, that his destiny was to be most intimately connected. The names of Paula and her daughter Eustochium are identified with the history of their austere director, and the letters addressed to them by him have been in all ages among the manuals of nuns and devotees. Under the influence of their friendship a fresh zeal for biblical study seized him, for now he was sure of readers eager and able to enjoy the results of his labors. Jerome was always very dependent upon feminine society, and when most eloquent in praise of retirement or in denouncing the vanity of the sex, he proved his dependence by the assiduity with which he courted their regard, and addressed to them his ghostly epistles. He had not a little of that bachelor temperament which leads so many men to rail against the vanity of woman and at the same time never be happy without her society. His letters to Paula and Marcella contain some of his most valuable biblical interpretations. When we look over his letters to his female friends upon the worth of celibacy, we cannot but wish that for his own credit he had always confined himself to scriptural exegesis. How he could have written as he did upon virginity to a young girl like Eustochium[1] we cannot understand. That epistle is in shocking taste, and detestably gross in its allusions. The monk either sinned against the prevalent standard of propriety in such statements and illustrations, or Roman society had sadly degenerated since the days of Cicero and Tullia, or delicacy of speech had been placed among the dainty refinements of the world and with them been put off by the ascetic party. With some reason, a prejudice arose against the instigator of the ascetic movement. The relatives of the wealthy ladies whom he had converted looked upon him as the robber of their

[1] Martianay, T. IV. Ep. XVIII. p. 27.

inheritance. The clergy winced beneath his rebukes, and were not slow in retaliating. It was looked upon as an intolerable grievance that young women were prohibited from associating with men, and that wine should be forbidden. It was thought that Blesilla, the second daughter of Paula, whose second marriage Jerome had prevented, was brought to her premature death by excessive austerities, and such was the excitement upon the subject, that the populace at the funeral were provoked almost to violence against the author of the wrong. Jerome's popularity so far waned that he who was regarded as the most available candidate to succeed to the chair of Damasus found his position in Rome far from comfortable.

But he was not of a temper to be put down by his enemies. Their very attack upon him he made the occasion of gaining a yet more commanding position. He looked towards the East, for some calm retreat, where from the heights of monastic sanctity, he might still dictate to the church, and act upon its opinions and manners as never before. To the maiden Asella[1] he wrote a parting letter, giving his view of Rome, and his three years' stay there, leaving to her and her friends the task of vindicating his memory from the charges brought against him in the Babel to which he now pronounced his farewell. Attended by his younger brother Paulinianus, by the presbyter Vincentius and several monks, he embarked in August 385 for Palestine. Paula and Eustochium soon joined him at Antioch. It was no small triumph to the monk and his cause, that this noted woman, whose family boasted the blood of Aeneas and the Julian race, should leave the city of the Caesars, for the land of the Nazarene and a life of self-denial. From Antioch, the coming winter, the company of devotees began their tour of Palestine. At Jerusalem, the Roman pro-consul prepared for Paula a stately abode, but she chose to lodge in a humble cell. Visiting Bethlehem, Paula was overwhelmed with emotion as she looked upon the place of the Saviour's birth, and resolved to make that her abiding place. First, however, she must see Egypt. In Egypt, as elsewhere, Jerome did not allow his devotional raptures to blind him to his favorite pursuits. The sites hallowed by ancient miracles, by saintly men, or memorable deeds, he investigated with critical eye, and notwithstanding his gray hairs he was not ashamed to sit as a learner in the catechetical school where the blind Didymus now discharged the office of the great Origen.

Returning to Bethlehem, the devotees gave themselves in good earnest to the contemplative life. A few years saw Jerome transferred from his little cell at the gate of the town, to the charge of a mo-

[1] Martianay, Ep. XXVIII. p. 65.

nastery erected by the charity of Paula, who herself was at the head of a similar establishment for nuns. Here Jerome passed the remainder of his days, living in the simplest manner, never relaxing his austerities, and finding his only diversion in biblical study, letter-writing and theological controversy. He applied himself with new zeal to the Hebrew language, under the guidance of the Jew, Baranina, who came to him by night from fear of violence from his own nation. In the inquiring minds of Paula and her daughter, in the enthusiasm of nuns, monks and the vast crowds of pilgrims who sought the shrine of Christ's birth, the devoted scholar found motive and appreciation sufficient to encourage him in his work. His vision of judgment did not prevent him from reviving his classic studies, and for the instruction of children confided to his care if not for his own entertainment, he opened once more the forbidden pages of the great heathen masters. Yet the Bible was his absorbing study, and at the request of Paula, in spite of his professions of inability, he was led step by step to give a kind of commentary upon nearly the whole of the Scriptures, for the instruction of herself and daughter. Next to those of Paula, stood the claims of the Roman widow Marcella, who upon the death of her mother Albina, sought consolation anew in the sacred books. His first labors were his comments upon the epistles to Philemon and to the Galatians, the Ephesians and to Titus. Then he turned to the Old Testament, and gave an explanation of the book so cherished by the monks, Ecclesiastes. Then (about 390) appeared his tracts on Hebrew Proper names—on the Names and Position of Places mentioned in the Bible,—and his Hebrew Questions upon the book of Genesis. In rapid succession came his completion of his translation of Didymus on the Holy Spirit, his seven tracts on Psalm x—xvi, his Lives of Malchus and Hilarion, his prosecution of his enterprise of revising the old Latin version of the Scriptures from the Alexandrian. He now began his great task of translating the Old Testament from the original Hebrew, and by the year 393 completed the books of Samuel, Kings, Job and the Prophets, and meanwhile composed commentaries upon five of the lesser prophets, besides writing at the suggestion of the Roman prefect, his catalogue of distinguished church writers.

From the calm retirement of his cell, the monkish student was now startled by the rise of a powerful adversary of the monastic doctrines. Jovinian had asserted at Rome the worthlessness of celibacy in securing salvation, and maintained that all baptized Christians stood equally accepted in the kingdom of heaven. The ascetic school at Rome was scandalized at this attack upon their darling doctrine, and Jerome as

with a scream of horror at the outrage, sprang to the rescue first with two books against the heretic, and then (394 or 395) with an apology for the previous work, whose ultraism was met with scorn from his enemies and fears from his friends. The fierce champion of monasticism, however, must have been gratified at this time with the notice of the renowned Augustine, who first wrote to him in 393, to introduce a young clergyman to his regard, and who afterwards renewed the correspondence. Yet the testy recluse ill brooked the adorer even of Augustine, and a jealousy sprung up between two men who of all others ought to have been friends, from their peculiar fitness to benefit each other. Jerome was the scholar and Augustine the theologian. The learning of the one would have been a great aid to the profound thought of the other by furnishing exact information, whilst the logic of the thinker would have been of invaluable service to the scholar in chastening his rhetoric and invigorating his mind. But these two veterans of the Latin church were upon ill terms one with the other, until at last common hostility to Pelagius brought them into agreement.

The other controversies which in turn engaged the mind of Jerome we can merely mention, as they are so fully treated in church histories. Sad is it when friends fall out with one another, especially friends from youth upwards. Such was the lot of Jerome and Rufinus in the famous *Origenistic* controversy. It was natural enough that Jerome should be troubled at being identified, even in a friendly spirit, at Rome through Rufinus with the school of Origen, for much as he prized the Alexandrian scholarship, he was by his position and nature, little inclined to his Platonizing theology. He erred sadly in going to such extremes, and so reviling the illustrious man whom he had once ranked next to the apostles. Ten years the controversy lasted (394—404), and did not end until it rent Christendom into hostile factions, and brought discord to Jerusalem and Bethlehem. Posterity has very amicably united the two names placed in such opposition by this controversy, for Jerome has been called the Origen of the Latin church. But whilst the Latin father is the superior in broad and exact scholarship, the great Alexandrian bears the palm for philosophical acuteness, penetrating judgment, calm faith and uniform charity.

But it was upon the head of the follower of Jovinian and the oppugner of the rising passion for relics, pilgrimages, celibacy and asceticism, that the fiercest anathemas of the saint were to fall. Nothing in the whole compass of theological controversy has ever come before us, that has seemed more fierce than his second letter against Vigilan-

tius.[1] He writes as if his dearest convictions of Christianity had been assailed, and as if he saw in his alarm his whole stock of ascetic riches snatched away at one fell swoop by this wretch whom by a play upon his name he calls Dormitantius or sleepy-head.

But even during these years of controversy his studies and correspondence went on. His translation[2] of the Bible was completed by the year 404, a year marked by the death of Paula. His commentaries were continued during the remaining sixteen years of his life. His prefaces to them are very rich in illustration of the history of the times. The conquest of Rome by Alaric is brought nearer to us by the pathetic allusions to it in the commentary upon Ezekiel; and the unfinished pages upon Jeremiah, from which death in the year 420 snatched the aged student, are in mournful unison with that age of declension, and that life so solitary and desolate in its close. Yet with all the loneliness of his position, and in the midst of great revolutions that shook the empire, and endangered his own retreat, the soul of the monk could not be utterly desolate. He had something to hope from his labors for the church. With his visions of heaven, no mean prospect of influence upon future ages must have been mingled. We are willing to view him as an earnest devotee, and deem the sonnet of the Oxford bard[3] no exaggeration:

The peaceful star of Bethlehem
Came o'er thy solitude,
The radiance of that heavenly gem
Lit up thy sterner mood;
Yea, like a star in murky wells,
Cheering the bed where darkness dwells,
The images of earth its happier light imbued.

The thought of the Eternal child
Upon thy cloistral cell
Must sure have cast an influence mild
And like a holy spell,
Have peopled that fair Eastern night
With dreams meet for an Eremite,
Beside that cradle poor, bidding the world farewell.

Yet other thoughts may have crossed the mind of that old man and blended with his anticipation of bliss. There he rests upon his miserable pallet about to breathe his last. He has lived through a most interesting period—not far, probably, from a century of eventful history.

[1] Martianay, Tom. IV. Classis III. p. 279.

[2] Given by Martianay, T. I. under the name Bibliotheca Divina. Not in the edition of Erasmus.

[3] The Cathedral. Oxford: 1841. p. 297.

He has known the leading men and taken part in the leading movements of his time. The prominent actors in church and State had passed away. Augustine alone of the renowned fathers survived. The daughter of his cherished Paula, Eustochium, had died the previous year, and with her the brightest thread in his life was rent. He almost alone remains. Yet many signs appeared to indicate that the labor of his life was not to pass away. His eye before it closes forever, perhaps looks upon his books, those friends that were never unkind or variable—upon his own manuscripts, the fruit of years of toil, his commentaries, his translation of the Scriptures, that darling child of his studies. In these thoughts the dying man might well feel happy. As he thought of his years of seclusion, he might deem himself nearer God by withdrawal from the world. But could he have seen gathering around him the images that history must associate with him, what would have been the feeling of the expiring monk? Could his eye have been gifted with aught of the prophetic power that death is sometimes believed to impart, how it would have glowed with pride, as he looked upon that mighty order of men who followed him in the monastic life, who formed communities in all lands, and bore civilization to barbaric wilds, and kept learning in sacred trust during the ages of darkness, who forced their doctrine of celibacy upon the church, made its ministers adopt their discipline, who rose in signal instances above the imperial throne, and wielded power such as was never granted to the sword of Alexander or the sceptre of the Caesars. Shall we not believe, too, that his eye would have darkened with something of horror, could he have seen the blacker forms in that monkish band who have mortified human appetites only to indulge preternatural passions, and who are to be blamed more than any others for stirring up religious wars, wielding the rack and kindling the fagot? Surely he would have had little toleration for the degenerate age of monasticism, when retirement from secular observation was too often the shelter of gluttony and licentiousness. Surely, too, he would have gloried in the thought of the innumerable students of sacred learning who were to follow in his steps and call him master. He who could refuse a mitre for the retirement of his cell, could not refuse the wreath placed upon his head by the Council of Trent in the precedence given to his Vulgate Bible. Could he have looked into the cell of the monk of Wittenberg and seen the form of Luther bending with rapture over a copy of that same Vulgate Bible, and drawing from it principles that cast down so much of priestly despotism, and created a new civilization, perhaps the dying man would have found

in his pride as a scholar something to console him for the wreck of many superstitions which he cherished as a monk.

But we have a more serious task to pursue than to deal in such imaginations. We are called to give some opinion of the character of Jerome's labors, and of his worth as a scholar, theologian and Christian man.

As a man of letters, Jerome had no equal surely in the Latin church. He stands more than any other man as a connecting link between the literature of the classic and the middle ages. Augustine understood better than he the philosophy and ethics of the old Greek and Roman civilization, and dealt far more than Jerome with fundamental ideas. But with the classic literature in its own form and dress he had small acquaintance. He was not skilful in the use of the Latin tongue, provincial as he was, alike in birth and education; of Greek he knew little and of Hebrew nothing. Of these three languages Jerome was sufficiently master to enable him to enjoy and interpret their master pieces, whilst in the use of the Latin, he was so accomplished as to win, not without reason, from Erasmus, the unsurpassed Latinist of modern times, the name of the "Christian Cicero." Whether his family was of Roman origin or not, we are not able to say, nor whether from the nursery he learned to prattle in the Latin or Illyrian tongue, but it is certain that from his early childhood he was taught by a Roman teacher, and thoroughly drilled in the Latin language. If his family was of Illyrian origin, as is probable, it by no means follows that they had not adopted the language of the people who had for centuries governed them, and to whom Illyria had furnished many distinguished men, and more than once, as in the case of the Dalmatian Diocletian, given a monarch in one of her sons. What the original stock of the Illyrian tribes was, is somewhat uncertain. Some deem it to have been Sclavonic, others like Mannert, and with greater plausibility, trace it to the Thracian family, and consequently to the Pelasgic races. If the Thracian family was in great part of Celtic blood, as we are told on good authority, it would not be difficult to trace that blood in the peculiar temperament of the saint, so sensitive and excitable, so keenly alive to praise and blame, in style and spirit so often reminding us of Irish enthusiasm and French volatility.

His education was such as to bring him into close communion with the best literature extant. In Rome, Constantinople and the East, he had diligently studied, and upon its own genial soil he had devoted himself to the languages and letters of the great nations, who had held the empire of thought. It was a happy circumstance that he flourished

when he did—at a time when the classic literature was still taught in the schools, in its original purity, and before the barbaric invasions had done their destructive work with those literary monuments that had already lost their hold upon the ideas and affections of the people. Literature always rests upon religion as its ultimate foundation, and as the leading minds and the popular feelings went over to the Christian church, the literary idols of the classic ages must fall. It was well that Jerome caught so much of their spirit, and breathed it through his translations and letters into the church of the middle ages. Rail as much as he would against the old poets, philosophers, orators and historians, he was always careful to treasure up their riches, and perhaps never showed his obligations to them more than in the very periods in which he set forth their worthlessness, and sent them all to the realm of darkness. The Latin Vulgate has undoubtedly had more influence upon the mind of Europe than any other book previous to the Reformation, and has had no small effect upon the translation and interpretation of the Bible since the Reformation. From Jerome the Vulgate has its chief characteristics. Of this there can be but little doubt, even if we accept the largest estimate that has been made in regard to alterations of that version since Jerome's day. To attempt a critique of the Vulgate is beyond our purpose, to say nothing of our ability. To defend it from all censure would be folly. In some respects, it must be regarded as having done great harm to evangelical religion, as in translating the Greek *μετανοήσατε*, agite poenitentiam, rendered in the Douay version so speciously "do penance," and the Greek "*ἐπιούσιον*," supersubstantialem, a rendering of the Lord's Prayer so favorable to Romish notions of the Eucharist. But surely none can deny to its style the praise of great richness and majesty, and to its renderings the credit of general fidelity and correctness. We must allow the translator the honor of singular independence in his mode of dealing with the apocryphal books, and of being unwilling to defer to the prejudices of the age and escape the denunciations of antagonists like Rufinus, by placing them among the canonical Scriptures. His study of the Hebrew language was of itself no small proof of his fidelity to the cause of sacred scholarship. The Hebrew was almost a proscribed tongue. For his devotedness to it, he was accused of an outrage upon the good name of the Seventy, of following a course unexampled by apostles and saints, and of preferring Barabbas to Jesus by becoming the pupil of the Jew Baranina. Augustine too dissuaded him from Hebrew studies, and besought him to be content with revising the old version by the Septuagint, and not alarm the churches by any dangerous novelties. The praise of a faithful schol-

arship far in advance of his age therefore belongs to the monk of Bethlehem. The earnest pursuit of knowledge under difficulties is always noble. And to judge of Jerome's merit as a Hebraist, we must not estimate his difficulties by the standards of our own day of philological appliances. The grammar of the Hebrew had not begun to be written, the Masoretic text had not been settled, and the Chaldee Targums with the poor interpretations given in the Mishna, constituted the monk's philological apparatus. How far deficiencies could be supplied by the living voice of the teacher, we cannot definitely say. But surely Baranina could not well teach more than he knew, and his knowledge could not have been great when measured by the standard of a Schultens or Gesenius.

It would be very strange if with a temper like his, Jerome did not claim full enough consideration for his own Hebrew renderings. He is unquestionably sometimes unjust to the authors of the Septuagint, and prefers in some instances a poorer translation to that given by them. Yet the position which he occupied, and the qualifications which he possessed, could not but give many advantages over the Alexandrian interpreters, and enabled him certainly to aid Christians in their controversies with Jews by affording a more correct understanding of the Old Testament in its relations to the New. Such men as Stilling claim almost supernatural infallibility for Jerome's Hebrew. It is enough for us to turn to Father Simon's[1] more candid pages, and learn from this Catholic scholar's admission that the translator of the Vulgate is by no means free from error. We are perhaps safe in saying with Le Clerc and Von Cölln, that Jerome learned as he was, never attained to a scientific knowledge of the principles either of the Greek or the Hebrew Grammar.

As a commentator, Jerome deserves less honor than as a translator, so hasty his comments generally are, and so frequently consisting of fragments gathered from previous writers. His merit however is, and this was by no means a common one in his day, that he generally aims to give the literal sense of the passages in question. He read apparently all that had been written by the leading interpreters before him, and then wrote his own commentaries in great haste without stopping to distinguish his own views from those of the authorities consulted. He dashed through a thousand lines of the text in a single day, and went through the gospel of Matthew in a fortnight. He sometimes yielded to the allegorical methods of interpretation and showed frequent traces of the influence of his study of Origen. Yet

[1] R. Simon, Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament, T. I. pp. 244—249, 257—259, 393—397. Rotterdam, 1685.

he seems not to have inclined to this method so much from his own taste as from the habit of his time. And if of the four doctors of the church particularized by some writers, to Gregory belongs excellence in *tropology*, to Ambrose in *allegory*, to Augustine in *anagoge*, to Jerome is given the palm in the literal and grammatical sense. We cannot however exonerate him from frequent extravagances as a rhetorician and allegorist. Whilst few will with Erasmus dispute the verdict that assigns to Augustine the dialectic palm, few will deny that the grammatical doctor often rivals Gregory in his tropes and Ambrose in his allegories. Whether writing a letter of acknowledgment to Eustochium for a basket of cherries and a dove, or to Marcella for cups and chairs, or elucidating a prophetic vision or gospel parable, he could exhibit a proficiency in finding double senses and mystic meanings, as far fetched as anything in Origen, and an ingenuity more suitable for a desperate rhymester than a grave theologian.

Rich and eloquent as his style frequently is, he does not appear to have had very good taste as a critic. He had not that delicate appreciation of an author's meaning, that enables one to seize hold of the main idea or sentiment, and through this interpret the language and illustrations. He was not a master of reproductive criticism. He could not reproduce the thoughts of the prophets and poets of the Old Testament, in his own mind, and throw himself into their position. Their poetic figures he sometimes treats as logical propositions, and finds grave dogmas in casual illustrations. His want of good taste in the *morale* of many of his allusions, we judge the more clemently from remembering the unnaturalness of his way of life and the effect of his habits of seclusion and mortification upon his notions of social propriety.

As a theologian he cannot be placed among the foremost of his age, unsurpassed as was his influence upon biblical study and ecclesiastical life. As Neander has justly observed, his mind did not so much tend to unity as to details. He was never haunted like Augustine with the passion for ideal truth. Student of the Scriptures as he was, he puzzles us to learn what was his specific belief. He is content to deal with the common places of established doctrine, and although he sometimes startles us as in his assertion that the clergy were originally equal, and that faith in Christ is the rock of Peter, the foundation of the church, with an almost protestant freedom, he rarely departs from the general belief except to incline the more to monastic superstition. He[1] obviously had a monk's jealousy of the secular clergy, and makes

[1] Vide, T. IV. Com. in Matt. Cap. XVI. p. 74, 75. In Ep. ad Galat. Cap. IV. p. 273. Epist. LXXXII. ad Oceanum. p. 648. In Epist. ad Titum, p. 407. Epist. ad Evangelum, CI. p. 802, 803. It will be remembered that all our quotations are from the edition of Martianay.

frequent allusion to their pride. In a spirit not unlike Luther's, he denounces their disposition to arrogate to their own official virtue the power that belongs only to God and his word. They who, like the German Rösler,[1] have endeavored to drag out a system of doctrine from his works have had but sorry success. As a scholar, he was bold and frequently original. As a theologian, he was little better than a parasite, who lived at other men's tables. His views seem to have differed much at various times, and one, as Simon judiciously observes, must study his relation to his times and their strifes to account for the inconsistencies of his assertions. He leaned upon the prevalent power in most things, and when he felt the growing influence of Rome, he seems not so much from prudence as from the necessity of his nature, to have attached himself to her hierarchy. Hence, as well as for his monastic notions, the honor in which he has been held by Rome. Papacy has no benedictions to bestow upon independent thought, and has given to Jerome the aureola denied to Origen and Tertullian. The monk of Bethlehem clung to Rome like the misletoe to the oak, and about him monks and priests have gathered in awe and admiration like Druids about their mystic tree.

As a theologian, he affirmed the doctrines of the worth of celibacy, the ascetic life and the use of relics and pilgrimages more than any others, and thus as a positive dogmatist he can meet with little honor from protestants. As an antagonist of heretics he was far more prominent, than as a systematic theologian. He was willing to rest upon the symbols of the councils of Nice and Constantinople like the other Catholics of his age. He was not so conspicuous for his defence of their fundamental doctrines as for the assertion of his monastic principles. Although it is not easy to draw out his opinions into a definite system, it is beyond question that most of the views that were afterwards embodied in the papal creed lurk potentially among his pages, and that he did much to prepare the way for prayers to saiuts and honors to relics, and the whole array of priestcraft. His controversies drew from him his most elegant works; but even in these his rhetoric goes far before his logic, his learning is more conspicuous than his discrimination. Schroeckh asserts no libel in classing him with those men who have read more than they have reflected. Philosopher, orator, philologian, dialectician, Hebraist, Graecist, Latinist; adept in three languages, though he might designate himself, without insincerity, the versatility of his endowments is small compensation in the view of a protestant mind for his want of independent

[2] Bibliothek der Kirchenvater, the IX. S. 92—233. Quoted by Schroeckh, T. XI. p. 219.

thought, and for the servility with which he surrendered all his gifts to the service of monkish fanaticism. When as in his dialogues against the Pelagians, he enters the theological lists, we see at once his strength and his weakness. His work shows something of the grace whilst it borrows the form of the Tusculan Questions, yet when compared with Augustine's tract on the same subject, betrays the vast difference between the discursive scholar and the close logician. In fact his doctrinal system had none of the definiteness of Augustine's, and stickler as he was for the merit of works of austerity, he was not in a position to assail the fundamental doctrine of the precursor of Arminius in the defence of human ability. How little of a champion of free elective grace he was, on the whole, Luther's estimate of him shows. Luther should have spoken with more respect of the scholar to whom he owed so much in his scriptural labors, yet he had no slight grounds for the judgment recorded in his Table Talk: "Jerome should not be named nor counted among the teachers of the church; though he was a heretic, yet I believe that he is saved through faith in Christ. He says nothing of Christ, since he takes only his name upon his lips. I know none of the fathers to whom I am so hostile as to Jerome; for he treats only of fastings, diet, virginity, etc. If he would even make the works of faith prominent and urge them, this would be something; but he teaches nothing, neither of faith nor hope, nor love, nor of the works of faith."

It is no easy task to portray a character so mingled as Jerome's. We may at once dismiss the fulsome eulogists, who like Martianay and Stilling almost deify him. We cannot go with the extravagant praises which Erasmus heaps upon him in a spirit and style so much like that of the saint himself. As little satisfied are we with those who go to the opposite extreme, and call him like Isaac Taylor a mere intellectualist, or, like Von Cölln, regard sensuality and vanity combined with superstition as the most prominent elements of his character.

An intellectualist he surely was, if "gazing upon books and parchments with fond and greedy satisfaction," could make him so. Yet he was more than a book worm. He was a man of intense feeling, and his chief works are full of the marks alike of his social sensibilities, his irascible passions and his devotional zeal. His intellect always worked with most efficiency when busied in writing to gratify a devout friend's desire of knowledge or to denounce an enemy of the church. Although not prone to ascend from facts to ideas, nor to soar into the realm of the higher imagination, he breathes into his learned

pages a singular fervor, and relieves what else would be wearisome pedantry by a most exuberant and often eccentric fancy.

In the moral elements of his character, he was far from being one of those whom a benignant nature as well as privileged education places among the saints. We wonder that so judicious and well read a writer as the historian Milner, should say of him that he appears never to have known the extreme conflicts with indwelling sin which to later converts have given so much pain. He had most unruly passions. His irascibility yielded not a jot beneath the austerities of his retirement, and the lusts which stained his early days never ceased to affect his imagination after his habits were beyond the breath of suspicion. We need little wonder that with his peculiar temperament, he chose the ascetic life. His ardent religious sensibility would not allow him to lead a life of pleasure, and he felt no security from the allurements of the world unless removed from its vanities. At once eager to join in every theological strife, and keenly sensitive to every attack upon himself, he loved a position in which he could act freely upon public opinion from a covert which none could invade. He was as one of those creatures who live in a shell and are alike fierce in their attack and secure in their retreat. His very love of power would combine with his religious zeal and imitative tendency to lead him to the monastic life. Ill fitted to struggle with men of sterner mould in the shock of affairs, he readily yielded to the influence of the ascetic party, and, engrossed by their ideas, he gave more than he secured, and from being at first a follower, he became the leader of the oriental movement in the Western church. His love of study was of course gratified by the course which he took. In his books, in the vicinity of admiring monks and nuns, in a retirement which at once inspired his visions and enabled him to dictate to the universal church, he found an enjoyment not to be found at Rome or Constantinople. From the most distant regions cases of conscience and questions of scholarship were submitted to him. Hedibia of Gaul besought him to clear up her difficulties in biblical study in a series of questions not a little puzzling even in our day, and a young French ecclesiastic came to him with tears, and entreated him to write to his mother and sister to live in the same house and not incur scandal by separate residences and clerical boarders.

That he was fanatical, we must with Isaac Taylor certainly maintain, if fanaticism be the combination of malign feeling with religious enthusiasm. He was a favorite at once of the scourge and the symbol, and under different circumstances might have become a fanatic of

the banner and the brand. But he declares that he had no enmity to men, only to their errors, and that he neglected his own quarrels to take up those of God—a declaration made undoubtedly by all bigots and made perhaps sincerely whether by a Mohammed or Dominic—a Galerius or Bonner. That he would have wreaked his vengeance upon the persons of his adversaries had they fallen into his power, is not however probable, ferocious as is his invective. He calls himself the watch-dog of the church, and says that his duty was to bay at all her foes. But like all noisy quadrupeds of his class, his bark was worse than his bite. We like less than anything his mode of speaking of the dead who had crossed his path. He declares that Jovinian, the Luther of that time, in swinish indulgence rather belched out his spirit than expired when he died, "non tam emisit spiritum quam eructavit." He was not gifted with that nice moral sense that is so necessary an element in the religious character and so powerful a check upon fanatical tendencies. In his controversy with Augustine upon the allowableness of falsehood as in the case at issue between Peter and Paul, we cannot but recognize in Jerome the germ of that erroneous principle that bore its ultimate fruits in Jesuit expediency.

That he was the Christian Cicero, may be said with some justice, if the saying means only that he was the most eloquent of the Latin fathers. We may recognize in him too something of the morbid sensitiveness of the Roman orator, and may draw a parallel between the revolution produced in the Roman mind by Cicero's importation of the Greek philosophy with that produced by Jerome in the Western church by his translation of the oriental theology. We may see too in both great beauty of expression combined with great force of invective, and find in the flatterer of Pompey and the denouncer of Antony, features not unlike those of the sycophant of Damasus and the defamer of Jovinian. But Cicero had a mind of far the larger mould, and however imperfectly he may have attained his wishes, he aspired to see truth in its glorious unity, and had intimations of an immutable morality based upon the eternal law of God, such as never seems to have inspired the soul of the monk of Bethlehem. The fancy is an interesting one that conjectures what course a man like Cicero would have taken had he lived under the Christian dispensation. He surely would have found something in the pages of St. John and St. Paul to save him from the superstitions of the man who has been praised so much as the heir of his eloquence.

To us, Jerome seems to combine certain elements of character that may be found singly in various noted men. He had the patient scholarship and brilliant rhetoric of Erasmus, without his good sense and

taste, and the fiery zeal and copious invective of Luther, without his tender humanity and noble clemency. In his eulogium upon the ascetic life and the graces of virginity, he indulged in sentimental raptures, in a style not unworthy of Hervey, the flowery moralist of the tombs, whilst upon topics of merely philological learning, he often exhibits a dryness of detail that tried the patience of good Father Simon, and led the critics of the seventeenth century to turn from his pages in despair. His wayward and petulant temper, his biting jest and shrewd insight, to say nothing of his bearing towards the sex to him so essential and so proscribed, reminds us often of Dean Swift, whilst in visions of angels and raptures of prayer and contemplation, his devotion must place him among those saints, who like Bernard and Francis have thought heaven the nearer as earth and humanity were most despised. Collombet finds in him as the eulogist of Fabiola and Paula the precursor of that master of funeral eloquence, Bossuet, and couples his name with Gerson, as the condescending teacher of children. In his letter to Laeta upon the education of her daughter, the younger Paula, we cannot but take occasion for rejoicing that Fenelon in following his path of celibacy, did not adopt his views upon the education of girls; whilst in his mode of treating of married life and clerical follies, as in his letters against Helvidius, and to Eustochium and Rusticus and Nepotianus, we may frequently imagine to ourselves resemblances, that connect the name of the most ghostly of the ancient fathers with that recent magazine of satire and caricature, whose title is rarely mentioned in theological journals, and whose influence is anything but ascetic.

We cannot leave the subject before us without suggesting a few thoughts that are prompted by this survey of Jerome's life, labors and character. He stands before us as the type of a class of men who have had and still have vast influence upon the church and world. That he was a monk in the modern sense of that term we are far from saying, for he lived upon principles very different from the rules of Benedict and Bernard. He was not in his mature years the advocate of solitary life, but of life in community, and of this too not under very rigid restrictions. Yet his whole soul was engrossed by the monastic doctrine, and he resented nothing so much as an attack upon the superhuman sanctity of chastity. More than any other man, he has tended to give the Roman church its monastic elements. He virtually laid the foundations upon which Leo and the two Gregories builded, and Paul IV. and Sextus V. labored to restore the papal hierarchy. What would the hierarchy have been without the celibacy of the clergy, and what would the clergy have been without the mo-

nastic orders. Behind the magnificent array of bishops, cardinals and popes, we look back to the recluse of Bethlehem as the most efficient advocate of the principles that consolidated their power.

What need of caution in considering the whole system of polity and theology thus based upon a false foundation. The whole papal creed shows the traces of those spectral, unearthly beings, whom Jerome has done so much to form and exalt. Placed in the most unnatural position, exiled from the mild charities, salutary discipline, and common sense education of social life, they were not in a condition to judge of man's true relations to God and his neighbor, much less to be the dictators of religious opinion. It behoves us to think very carefully whether the system of ritual and polity advocated not without considerable learning and piety in conspicuous quarters of the protestant world, and finding favor from not a few minds in this land of the Puritans, does not owe its peculiar characteristics to men who looked upon marriage as a desecration, and celibacy as the royal road to heaven. Let the divines of Oxford in their admiration of the fathers of the fourth century show up their notions of domestic life as well as of sacramental rites. With the homilies of Chrysostom and Augustine let them translate the letters of Jerome, and give their readers opportunity to see what monkish notions were rising into the ascendant in those days. It is here that Isaac Taylor has found his impregnable position in his controversy with the Oxford Tractarians. He shows beyond question, that if Christendom is to follow the lead of the fathers of the fourth century, we must bow down in reverence before the preternatural glory of the celibate life. We join with him alike in his estimate of the morbid feeling of the monastic system, and its tendency to distort the mind, and pervert its sense of Christian truth. Jerome's pictures of himself lead us not at all to covet his state of emotion, and if it be the heart that is the ultimate source of rectitude in moral judgments, we cannot look to him for our faith or morals. Far different the Messiah of the New Testament, far different the apostolic company. We should be sorry even to believe that any worthy husband and father living among those social relations which Jerome deemed so secular and distracting, were liable to be haunted by such visions of lust as tormented the monk's seclusion.

Yet, the life of Jerome ought to make us realize the vast power of self-denial. He was not indeed self-denying in all things, for even to the last year of his life he railed at heretics in a temper singularly petulant, and even in his closing commentary upon Jeremiah he showed the ruling passion strong in death, alike by the copiousness of his classic allusions and the vehemence of his invective against the

Pelagians. Yet he subdued many desires that in him were very strong, and in his devotedness to sacred learning, he merits the gratitude of all earnest scholars. The class of men whom he represents, at last put the world under their feet by being independent of its luxuries, and beyond most of its indulgencies. Their thirst for power, we may not indeed covet. But, surely, as we read of their self-control, and their achievements, we may justly ask ourselves, whether we do not make ourselves too dependent upon fortune, and if it would not be much better for us to have a far hardier culture, so that we might more readily live in the plainest manner, and in case of emergency surrender the usual comforts of life rather than bend the knee in sycophancy or stoop to any sin or shame. We have no respect for the doctrine that claims exalted merit for celibacy as such. We have respect for the man who is willing for the cause of science or religion to surrender the charms of a privileged home, and devote himself to the vigils of the student or the exile of the missionary, under circumstances which must compel him to forsake his purpose, or engage in it without wife or child either to share his anxieties or his rewards. One sentiment comes before us with peculiar force after reading the ancient eulogiums upon celibacy—a sentiment of respect for those who forego marriage for the sake of true piety or charity, whether in the broad walks of philanthropy or at the quiet fireside—a sentiment of contempt for the vulgar notion that stigmatizes the unmarried because they are so, forgetting how often love for parents or brothers and sisters has kept a noble woman from leaving her father's home, and devotion to letters or religion has moved the scholar or missionary to forsake all else for science or for the gospel.

One thought more, and we take leave of the monk of Bethlehem and all his brethren of the wilderness and the cell. They were men, and were driven into retirement by a feeling more or less active in all ages—not a little active now in some of its forms;—that sense of the insufficiency of the world for the soul's needs, that craving for a joy and peace that the world cannot give. Who does not sometimes sigh for retirement—for that "lodge in some vast wilderness," of which the Christian poet so pathetically sings? This feeling seems now to be reviving among Roman Catholic Christians, and shows itself, moreover, in various forms of thought and association among Protestants, and even free-thinkers. In the mother country a movement has actually been made towards having monasteries under a form "suited to the genius, character and exigencies of the church of England." In our New England we might marvel at an Antony in his solitary cave, or a Simeon on his lofty pillar of rock. Yet modes of living

akin to those of Antony are advocated by some ascetics in diet, and a school of thinkers have arisen who in their zeal for individuality of character and their jealousy of all that comes between the individual soul and God, place even man upon a peak of such lofty isolation and sublime egotism, that men seem but shadows, the world a phantom, and dispensing even with the mediation of Christ and the gospel, the transcendental hermit goes beyond even the Stylite, and creates a solitude that even to him would have been intolerable. It is not strange that they who have lived within the atmosphere of such notions, should have a yearning for the ancient church, that meets their craving by ministrations far more congenial with human sensibilities. There is nothing unaccountable in the obvious affinity between Romanism and ultra-spiritualism.

What turn, the dislike of exciting things and the desire to come out from them, that shows itself in every age, will take in our day, we cannot predict, nor will we venture to say that there must be ere long a reäction against the prevalent dynasty of gold and the industrial arts. That the movement of Newman will be followed to any great extent we are far from believing, nor do we believe that the great protest against the golden idol is to come from the school of Fourier, and that the coenobites of the Phalanstery are to displace those of the convent and monastery. We must be content with simple Christian principle, and at the feet of the Master be saved alike from subjection to the ascetic of the wilderness who was but his precursor, and to the epicurean who can never be his follower. Among men and in full sympathy with their joy and sadness, we may have our hours of communion with nature and the God of nature. We may deem it one of the best blessings of our improved civilization with its stable laws and guardian force, that we may have hours sacred to heaven and the soul without quitting the haunts of men; that without seeking the wilderness we may have an energy and self-control, that shall prove us like the Baptist, neither the reed shaken by the wind nor the slave of soft raiment, and more than the Baptist, sharers in the full gospel of the divine kingdom, drinking of a living fountain, and sheltered by a tree of life which he foresaw but never found in the Judean wilds. Not to the wilderness, but to God in nature, the Word, the Spirit, we may go and there find fresh zeal for action and new tranquillity after trials.

Even for privileged solitude we would not exchange our own home in our bustling century for the cave of Bethlehem or the cells of Iona.

ARTICLE VIII.

JOURNAL OF A VISIT TO THE YEZIDEES, WITH A DESCRIPTION OF THE EXCAVATIONS AT KHORSABAD.

By Rev. Thomas Laurie, American Missionary in the East.

Sunset found us just emerging from among the heaps of ancient Nineveh. And after a ride of four hours (twelve miles) north by east over the undulating surface of the rich plain of Assyria, we alighted for the night of the 18th of July, 1844, at the house of the French consul in Khorsabad. His usual residence is in Mosul, but he has built this for the purpose of carrying on his excavations with greater convenience. It was not the first time we had been received within its hospitable walls, nor was this the only mode in which M. Botta had proved himself one of the kindest of friends in that strange land. Were this the place, I should delight to dwell on many pleasant recollections of a friendship that can never be forgotten.

We spent the next day till towards evening in examining the interesting antiquities here brought to light. And time passed rapidly away in the company of unknown heroes of ancient Assyria, and the more agreeable society of their amiable discoverer. It is utterly impossible to give any adequate description of these excavations in less than a volume. And I am happy to be able to say that the French government have now begun to publish them in the same magnificent style in which they issued the 'Memoires de Persepolis.' But as they are perhaps the most interesting monuments of antiquity hitherto discovered in all this region, and as when once the inscriptions shall have been deciphered they promise to throw great light on one of the most important but hitherto obscure periods of Old Testament history, I cannot but give them a passing notice.

The mound of Khorsabad is between 600 and 700 paces in circumference, and stands near the north-west corner of an enclosed area of about a mile square. The walls of this area are similar to those near Mosul, that have been so accurately surveyed and described by Mr. Rich.[1] They are mere elongated mounds of earth whose ridge-like summit is interrupted here and there by superincumbent conical masses of the same material, apparently the remains of gates and towers.

[1] See his Travels in Koordistan, Vol. II. p. 48.

There is one thing in which they differ, however, from those just mentioned. They seem to have been coated externally with large square stones; though both may have been originally alike in this respect, if we allow the greater proximity of the former to Mosul, and their consequent convenience as a quarry from whence to build the modern city, as an explanation of the present difference in their ruins. This view may derive support from the fact that the old bridge at Mosul was constructed of large square stones, taken, if we may believe common report, from those very mounds. And those which M. Botta dug out of Khoyunjuk were carried off by order of the Pasha, to be used in some buildings he was erecting, almost as fast as the workmen rolled them down the steep sides of the mound.

The excavations at Khorsabad were begun on the western face of the mound, near the top, where the sculptures reached the surface. They were, however, in a very bad condition. The upper part had been totally destroyed, and some of the large figures had wholly disappeared from above the knee. Some had apparently been broken by violence, and others seemed to have been worn away by long exposure to the weather. But as the workmen advanced inward, toward the centre of the mound, which was higher than the edges, the ruins were much deeper and in a better state of preservation. More than eleven rooms have been excavated, the largest of them more than 100 feet in length by 30 in breadth, and yet not one half the surface of the mound has been explored. The walls of these rooms are about thirteen feet high, very thick, and formed of sun-dried bricks, faced on either side by a surface of stone. This stone, sometimes called Mosul marble, is a sulphate of lime, of a dark, dull color, and so soft that it can readily be cut with a knife. The stones stand upright, each block being about ten feet high by one foot in thickness, and from eight to twelve feet in breadth. On the surface of these the figures are executed in bas-relief. Some occupy the entire height of the stone, which is nine feet high, except the space which is used for the inscription at the bottom. And if memory does not deceive me, there were some which did not even leave room for that. These largest sculptures were in most instances in a remarkable state of preservation. One almost, involuntarily, looks around for the sculptor to explain his work. The sculpture itself is most admirably executed. Every muscle might afford a study for an anatomist. And though there is a general resemblance in the features, such as one should expect in people of the same family or race, yet each countenance wears an expression exactly corresponding to the situation in which the individual is represented. Some whom we took to be eunuchs—per-

haps some favorite servant, esteemed worthy to be represented in the monument erected in honor of his master—had a beardless face, and the full, heavy and rather effeminate cast of features usually ascribed to such. But the monarchs themselves, or if the monument was erected in honor of one king, the monarch and his nobles were depicted in a manner most worthy of their station. To say nothing of their embroidered robes of divers colors of needle work, meet for the necks of them that take the spoil, wrought by the fair hands of some princess of Nineveh, whose name has perished in the same oblivion that covers the artist who so accurately delineated it,—to say nothing of their gorgeous head-dress tinted with blue and vermilion, or of their ornaments of gold, and the rich display of tassels that almost concealed their feet as they hung down from the borders of their robes,—to say nothing of their sword and other armor, and their dignified posture and lordly bearing, there was something in their features that one may look for in vain among the finest models of the Grecian school. There you find passion, fiery, impetuous action; the restless outworkings of a restless mind. But here there was a dignity and composure, an embodiment of quiet and calm power, that hushes the tumult of one's feelings as he gazes, and fills him with a sense of power so great that scarce an effort is needed to secure the performance of its will. We feel as though we stood in the presence of a king, whose resources were so ample and so completely under control that the exercise of power was a pleasure rather than a task. We are suddenly transferred back to the golden age when thorns had not yet infested thrones, and crowns adorned brows unfurrowed by the cares of State. Those ancient kings, just awaked from the slumber of ages, are the very impersonation of regal dignity, and they look down on you with the same calm elevation with which they erst looked down on the nobles of distant lands, who came to lay their tribute and their submission at their feet. But a truce to idle fancies. Yet, let me ask in passing, whether these sculptures throw no light on the passage where the daughter of Zion is represented as seeing "men portrayed on the wall, the images of the Chaldeans portrayed with vermilion, girded with girdles upon their loins, exceeding in dyed attire upon their heads, *all of them princes to look to*, after the manner of the Babylonians of Chaldea, the land of their nativity," Ezek. 23: 14, 15.

In most cases there are two rows of figures on the same stone, with a broad line of inscription under each. These represent a variety of objects. One room is occupied with the delineation of a royal hunt. The king, standing in his chariot, drawn by fiery horses, their trappings richly painted, is protected from the sun by an overhanging

canopy. And while driven rapidly through the forests, the game falls on every side, transfixed by his arrows. Before him birds perch on the trees or flit from bough to bough. Deer are quietly feeding beneath them, and the timid hare peeps out of her hiding place. At his approach they flee. But soon birds fall transpierced, from the loftiest branches. Slaughtered deer lie here and there, and numerous attendants follow, well loaded with the spoils of the chase.

In another apartment two kings are seated at a banquet, in European rather than oriental style. They sit upright on chairs without backs, whose fore feet are carved in the form of lion's paws. One row of attendants bring goblets ornamented in front with a lion's head, and other dishes, while another row carry away the empty goblets to be replenished from a capacious tun some distance beyond.

Here they prosecute a siege, and while the besiegers in one style of dress, ply the battering ram and discharge their arrows at the besieged, those in another style of dress, and with different weapons, hurl defiance at the foe. Further on, one of the invaders advances to fire the city gate, while a row of figures in front of the wall, impaled by the breast, strike additional terrors into the hearts of their survivors within. Further on, the flames burst forth in every direction; some hurl their darts more fiercely than before, others lift up their hands in despair or tumble headlong into the flames, and others still fall, transfixed by the weapons of the besiegers, who press the assault on every side. Here dead bodies and headless trunks float down the river in front of a beleauguered fortress; there captives, loaded with chains, approach the conqueror seated on his throne. An officer, standing by a pile of human heads, waits with uplifted sword the nod that decides the fate of each as he passes by. In another apartment we are again relieved by the introduction of rural scenes. The river flows quietly through groves and along the borders of cultivated fields. The fish swim in its waters, men are bathing in the cool shade, or a long row of camels, horses and mules, attended by men of various features and different modes of dress, (among whom we can distinctly trace the well known thick lips, flat nose and curly hair of the African,) bear the royal tribute to the store-houses of the king.

Then there are battles on foot and battles on horseback. Chariot runs to meet chariot, or the charioteer drives *pell mell* over the wounded and the dying, who fall under the rapid darts of the warrior in the chariot. The wounded springs into the air in his death agony, or resting on his elbow his head sinks back to the earth. The carcasses of horses impede the chariot wheels. And Ezekiel's captains and rulers "clothed most gorgeously, horsemen riding upon horses, all of

them desirable young men, 23: 12, 23, the Babylonians and all the Chaldeans, Pekod and Shoa and Koa and all the Assyrians with them, all of them desirable young men, captains and rulers, great men and renowned, all of them riding upon horses, coming against thee with chariots and waggons and wheels and with an assembly of people which shall set against thee buckler and shield and helmet round about, 23: 23, 24," would seem to have been written by one who had walked through the halls of Khorsabad, ere it had been buried up, and whose record is preserved to attest the accuracy of that delineation of the prophet who *had been among the captives* by the river Chebar.

One other view must not be omitted; a city stands on the very edge of the waters, her walls apparently rising from its depths; fish of every kind, real and fabulous, sport in the flood. Ships are unloading huge beams of timber; companies of men bear it on their heads and shoulders to the place where they are constructing towers from which to attack the walls. "See there," said M. Botta, one day, "can that be Tyre and this the army of Nebuchadnezzar?" and he quoted the passage, Ezek. 29: 18, "Son of man, Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, caused his army to serve a great service against Tyrus. *Every head was made bald and every shoulder was peeled.*"

But the most remarkable sculptures are those at the gates. The entrances are guarded on each side by a monster of gigantic proportions. To the body of a bull is attached an immense human head. The side of the monster is covered by a wing that springs from his shoulder. The head is surmounted by a coronet, around which horns are twined like the shawl of a turban. A fifth foot has been added by the artist so that whether viewed in front or at the side the number might be complete. But what is as strange as any other part of it, this huge monster is carved from a single stone some fourteen feet high, by seventeen in length, and four in thickness. How in those early days the people managed to transport it, or to set it up on the mound, is a question I leave others to settle more competent to the task. Fifteen of these monsters, more or less perfect, have been found already. In connection with those that I saw, stood the figure of a bird's head, similar to some of the idols of Egypt. It was in front of one of these entrances that M. Botta found a bronze lion couchant, with a ring attached to his back from which a chain probably extended to some part of the gate. A copper chariot wheel was also found in one of the rooms.

The cuneïform or arrow-headed inscriptions are exceedingly abundant, for not only are they found beneath most of the figures, but all the floors of the passages from room to room are entirely covered with

them; as if the whole were a museum of history and these were tables of contents, telling the visitor what heroes and what events he may expect to meet with in the room before him. It is worthy of remark that when the inscriptions were thus exposed to be worn away by the feet of those passing and re-passing, the letters were filled up with copper so that the surface was as smooth as though the original stone had remained untouched, while there was no trace of any such precaution with reference to those on the walls. These inscriptions are more complex than those found near Persepolis, but not so complicated as the Babylonian. M. Botta has distinguished some hundreds of characters, each differing from the other, so that it would seem to be syllabic in its construction. Still it is premature to say much on that point at present. M. Botta has copied more than 100 folio pages of them, which, extended along in one line, would reach between two and three miles. So that with such a variety of material, and the learning and research of such scholars as Rawlinson in the East, and Grotefend and Lassen in Germany, we may hope for a vast accession soon to be made to our knowledge of Old Testament times and events. The French government sent out the same accomplished artist (M. Flandin) who sketched the sculptures of Persepolis, to take drawings of these, and the literary world will have no cause to mourn the loss of the originals. The designs of the Assyrian sculptor have been reproduced in all their life and beauty, and the copies will no doubt awaken more interest now than did the originals in the days of their glory.

If any are curious to know what this monument was, whether a palace, a temple or a tomb, to what age it belongs, and how it became buried so deep in the earth on the top of a mound so much higher than the neighboring plain, I can only refer them to the forthcoming work of the discoverer, and trust that there they will find much more clear and satiafactory light on these and kindred questions than it is in my power to afford them.

We would merely say, that some rotten wood, rotten though charred and many parts of the sculptures so calcined that they crumbled on exposure to the air, would seem to indicate that it had been destroyed by fire. But how some parts of it were buried so deep under the surface is a question not so easily solved.

We will only add that M. Botta had been excavating at his own expense for several months in the large mound of Khoyunjuk on the side of the Tigris directly opposite Mosul, but did not find much that was interesting. There were plenty of bricks with cuneïform inscriptions, plenty of large hewn stones, and some slabs of marble with

palm trees in bas-relief, but broken and disfigured; the whole showing evident marks of having been constructed out of the ruins of a more ancient building.

While he was patiently persevering in his efforts there, some of the natives informed him of sculptures of men and animals having been seen in this mound of Khorsabad and he at once despatched his workmen thither. I mention these previous excavations of M. Botta to show that it was no hap-hazard of fortune that first suggested these discoveries. They are the well earned result of patient toil and great expenditure, and however much others may boast of the wonders they bring to light in following the path so successfully opened by another, the world will decide whether it is more indebted to the Columbus whose intelligence conjectured *à priori* what ought to be found and whose enterprise persevered through long discouragement, till his most sanguine hopes were more than realized, or to any Americus Vespucius who may follow in the path thus pointed out, and boast that his sculptures forsooth are larger and his mound more extensive!

At 5 P. M., July 19th, we left Khorsabad and proceeded on our journey. Descending from the mound, we passed near the place where M. Botta found an altar in the form of a tripod with a band of cuneïform inscription round the top, as well as some sculptures smaller than those on the mound, but carved in a hard black stone. Shaping our course almost due north, we passed by some old foundations, some of which crossed our road; we then struck the first low range of hills at Ras el-Ain (head of the fountain). Here a copious spring bursts out of the limestone rock, and almost immediately is employed to turn a mill. Released from this, it is again pressed into the service of two or three others, and then is allowed to flow on uninterrupted into the Khausser which passes through the ruins of Nineveh, close to Khoyunjuk and empties into the Tigris opposite the upper part of Mosul. How different the wide expanse of plain, dotted now at distant intervals with its mud-built villages, from the scenes it witnessed in other days, when Assyrian villa and garden and palace adorned its shores! and when strengthened by its waters, flower and shrub and spreading tree defied the power of a noon-day sun! Even now, here and there an ancient mound built by the men of those ancient days overhangs its channel, as though they loved to erect their most pleasant retreats by the side of the running stream. Whether to sit at eventide and watch its placid flow at their feet, or whether by means of its waters to emulate the hanging gardens of Babylon, it is vain to conjecture. We only know that the mounds scattered over the plain of Assyria and

along the plain of Mesopotamia as far as Mardin, were generally erected either by the side of a water course or a spring or a low moist place where water was easily accessible. Could we read the journal of one of the exiles who once hung his harp here on the willows, we might know more of the dwellers on these now desolate heaps, who called the exiles in to sing the airs of Zion in order to while away the weary hours of them that wasted them.

But leaving such musings, we crossed the low range of hills that runs north-west from Jebel Makloub near its western termination, and after a slight descent wound up through a broken irregular valley to a high table land, covered at this season with withered grass, whose whiteness a few hours earlier would have been very painful to the eye. But at this hour the view was beautiful. Beneath us on the north lay the level plain of Yezid Khan, with here and there a village built close to the foot of an artificial mound. On the top of one of these the slanting rays of the sun revealed the battlements of a castle. Beyond it, the rugged sides of the outer chain of the mountains of Koordistan rose to the sky, sweeping round from below Akra on the east to beyond Elkosh on the west. The pinnacles of the distant Gara were just visible above it, telling of yet more rugged scenes that lay beyond, and just over the highest point of that nearest range, lies directly before us, but out of sight, the glen of Sheikh Ade, the object of our journey. Behind us on the south-east rises the solitary peak of Jebel Makloub, frowning down on the intervening hills, and more to the east but further away, the snowy pinnacles of Ravendooz shine white in the distance.

The sun had set while we lingered on this elevation, and his last rays were lighting up the farthest pinnacles when we descended to cross the intervening plain. This we did by the light of a burning prairie in the south-east. This may sound strange from a traveller in ancient Assyria. But the undulating surface that was burning was nothing else. The fervid rays of an Assyrian sun had done what only the frosts of a western winter can accomplish in giving the grass the requisite degree of dryness. And had a western settler gazed on it from the door of his log cabin, he could not have distinguished the features of a strange land. Darkness concealed the mountains too distant to reflect the glare, and the flames as they advanced from the plain of Navkûr, once the battle field of Alexander and Darius, and danced up the gradual ascent behind us, lighting up only the intervening distance that constantly increased as we proceeded in the opposite direction. Perhaps it might point out our position more distinctly were I to state that Yezid Khan and Navkûr are different parts of

the same plain lying between the ridge we had just passed, and the mountains before us. The former slopes to the west, and sends its waters in that direction to the Tigris. The latter slopes to the east and pays its tribute to the Gomel, which passes through it to the Jab. We crossed the plain not far from the dividing line, and the marshy land and croaking of frogs that saluted us here and there, told that the declivity as yet was scarcely sufficient to carry off the water.

We arrived at 9 o'clock at the village of Ain Sifna, glad to throw ourselves down on one of its flat earthen roofs for the night. There are here about one hundred houses, half of them Yezidee, and half Mohammedan with five or six families of Jews. It is beautifully situated on a gentle elevation which, if the mountains of Koordistan be compared to the billows of the ocean, is the last gentle wave that laves the sheltered beach. Yezidee tombs or temples, (for they are used for both,) adorn the eminences around; and on the highest one to the east, I had seen the villagers, on a previous journey, kissing the object that was first brightened by the beams of the rising sun. A new one now in process of erection gave an appearance of life and enterprise where it was least expected. It was on that same journey that a kid, frisking merrily among the dry stunted grass on one of the flat roofs, in the month of April, gave striking force to the passage that represents the wicked as the grass upon the house-top that withereth afore it groweth up. There are several mills in the village carried by the stream that comes down the valley from Sheikh Adi, and but for the oppression of the government, and the vices of the people, this might be the home of rural abundance and enjoyment. We were off before daylight and half an hour's ride, now for the first time since we left Mosul enlivened by the sight of trees, brought us to the entrance of the narrow defile up which lay our path for the rest of the way. Just before entering it, we had a fine but distant view of the plain of Navkûr, from an elevation near the village of Moosaika. But once entered, its steep rocky sides shut out all other sights. These rise abruptly on either side, strata piled above strata. Their perpendicular edges remind you of the inaccessible walls of some strong fortification. But here, as elsewhere, nature dwarfs the puny work of man, though the dwarf oaks that shoot out from between the rocks far above you, seem really worthy of the name. The glen is so narrow that it scarcely allows room for one narrow path by the side of the stream. High up on our left, a square opening in the smooth surface of the rock marks the former abode of a hermit, who could sit in the door of his cave and trace the course of the stream by the line of oleanders now in full bloom that fringe its banks. The willow, the hawthorn

and a flowering shrub with blossoms like those of the peach and plum tree occupy every spot of vantage ground. But their beauties are visible only in early spring. Still the sight of their green leaves is refreshing even now to eyes so long unused to verdure in the parched plains of Mesopotamia. Further up, a little strip of cultivated ground, scarce large enough for a flower bed, has squeezed itself in between the rocks and the water. Still further, other such strips widen into little fields of barley. But the harvest has long since passed. You might have met the reapers in the early part of May; now you can scarce distinguish the crop that last sprung from the red earth. Here is a valley coming in from the east whose high cliffs of red sandstone contrast strangely with the green foliage below. There on the west is the glen of Sheikh Adi. Now you see only the ancient Khan at its mouth, and the hardy trees that find a begrudged foothold on its rocky sides. But wait a little till we are fairly opposite, and the fluted cones of the temple shoot up from the surrounding shrubbery, while the two sides of the glen seem to join together to defend them from behind. We cross the brawling stream, wind along the steep side of the valley, then descend and recross the old moss covered stone bridge, and pushing aside the low branches of the trees that threaten to sweep us from our saddles, we arrive at the place where Satan's seat is. And first we must stoop as we go through that long low arch which in spring is all dripping with water, then cross the area where the wall of the court of the temple echoes the sharp tread of our horses over the rough stones, and alight under the shade of the spreading walnut trees at the outer door.

We met with no very gracious reception, but after some delay and with no small difficulty, we succeeded in securing a room that overlooked the court of the temple, and here were our quarters while we remained. Here we eat our meals, seated on boxes and travelling bedsteads, around our chicken and *pilau*. We spend the day, when not wandering around, under the long stone arch by which we entered. The stream of water, directed through it, occasionally renders it delightfully cool. And at night we sleep on the flat roof of our room, it would be pleasant to add, lulled to rest by the brawling brook, did not truth compel me to state that the nearer hum of clouds of musquitoes that infested the place was anything but lulling, though their nightly persecutions were more bearable than the daily rudeness and inhospitality of the Yezidees themselves.

These pertinaciously refused to furnish us with the smallest article of provision at any price, and only regretted that they had ever allowed us to dismount at all. Everything, aside from what we brought

with us, had to be procured from distant villages. And the Yezidees even threatened a poor man, who supplied us with milk every morning from a neighboring hamlet, with summary punishment if he dared to do so again; so that we were compelled to procure even that article from a distance of several miles. But if they were inhospitable, the heat at Mosul was still more so, and we determined, Yezidees and musquitoes to the contrary notwithstanding, to enjoy the moist shades of Sheikh Adi as long as we could. Indeed there was no alternative, for their inhospitality was not manifested till our horses had returned to the city, and the same cause which provoked it compelled us to stay and endure it.

It would be utterly impossible to give any correct account of the place in detail that would not weary the patience of any one who tried to read it. The valley instead of suddenly terminating here, as it appeared to do at a distance, only branches up on either side of the central hill that seemed to close it. Of course the surface is irregular and uneven enough to suit the most decided taste for disorder. The buildings, that are stuck around in every available nook and corner, are not less irregular. They only agree in one thing, and that is in being built of stone. There are as many as a hundred of them perched in every variety of situation, and equally dissimilar in form and size. But whether small or great, whether in the form of house or temple, long arch or short, open arch or closed, semi-cave or semi-subterranean, they are all substantial structures of stone and lime, and serve for the accommodation of those families at whose expense they are erected, during their stay at their several feasts. A large proportion of the houses have gone to ruin; others are in various stages of dilapidation, but two new ones have been erected during the last summer, and you see the rude scaffolding still left under the arches.

The larger and more important of the sacred buildings are those we first come to from below. There, on the right, is the large temple of Sheikh Adi which gives name to the place, and in the court of which are our quarters; close by and connected with the same building is that of Sheikh Yohanna (St. John), a strange name to occur in such a connection, but so we were informed. On the opposite side is the temple of Sheikh Shemesh (the sun), and between them is the sacred spring which is considered far more holy than the temples around it. We were allowed to go freely into and through them on the single condition of taking off our shoes, which ceremony was required of us, also whenever we would pass through the outer court to our room. But we were never allowed to look into the dark chamber that covered the fountain. This is kept constantly under lock and key, and

when our servant once asked to have the door opened, they affected to be astounded at his impiety, and told him that were he but to look in he would instantly be transformed into a brute.

In the account of this place in the Missionary Herald for Aug. 1842, it is said, that there are four springs. There are four basins or tanks built in a substantial manner of stone and lime. But the water flows from this sealed fountain, Cant. 4: 12, into the first of these and from that into the rest. The water is quite cool, but highly impregnated with lime, so that some of the channels about the premises are almost choked up with deposites of limestone, and large stalactites of the same have formed at the place where it pours out of the temple, from the height of several feet into the valley below. In the temple of Sheikh Adi is a reservoir large enough for a man to swim in, and so clear that you might read a book open at the bottom of it.

There is one regularity observable in the general confusion that reigns throughout. Whichever way we approach the fountain and the surrounding temples, we must pass under an arched passage similar to that already described. I counted five of them, one on every path by which it was possible to reach the place. Some of them are more than thirty paces long. What their design is, whether they have any connection with their religious ceremonies, must be determined by some one who has had more opportunity for observation, and is better acquainted with their history than I am.

The inside of their temples is very plain. They resemble the mosques of the Moslems in that respect, only I did not detect in the 'dim religious light' of that of Sheikh Adi anything corresponding to the Kubla (direction of Mecca), or Munbar (pulpit) of the latter. A row of square massy pillars built of stone and lime like the walls, divided the interior in the middle. A lamp hung between each pillar, and beneath it was a black, greasy, charcoal-like deposit as if drops of burning oil had fallen there for ages undisturbed. On the north side close by a *Mustubeh* (raised place for sitting in the oriental style), which they called the seat of Sheikh Adi, a curtain suspended before an opening in the wall was lifted up, and we entered under the Kubbe, or one of the fluted cones that we first descried in the distance. Here was nothing but a large rudely made box painted red and covered with an Arabic inscription, which the darkness did not allow me to make out. This was covered with a coarse cotton cloth, and was the only article of furniture, besides the lamps, that was to be seen. A door from this led apparently to some subterranean apartment under the hill. The walls of the temple outside were covered in an irregular manner, almost as though it had been the work of children, with vari-

ous devices engraved in the stones, such as birds, serpents, combs and an article that resembled a shepherd's crook or crozier. One stone over the door contained an Arabic inscription, and another was built into another part of the wall. But as the characters were somewhat indistinct and involved, and there were always some of the Yezidees present in the court, I did not succeed either in copying or decypher-ing them. It is to be presumed, however, that they refer simply to the building or more probably some subsequent repair of the temple itself. Rags were fluttering from the copper ornaments on the top of the cones.

We found in the Deir (convent) as they call it, besides the visitors who come and go, ten permanent residents; of these four were men, the rest were women. Three of the latter were unmarried. The monks (Rahban), as they called themselves at one time, or servants of Sheikh Adi, as they styled themselves at another, were all married; only one who lived to be a superior among them lived a life of celiba-cy, and he was an old man who from his own account had lived here for fifteen years.

The women here seemed to stand on an equal footing with the men. Indeed we were told that the person deemed most honorable in the convent was the mother of their sheikh. Their salutation after a short separation was a mutual kiss, 1 Cor. 16: 20, and no distinction of sex was observable either in the giving or receiving it.

The monks wear a coarse, woollen tunic, dyed black, over their other clothing. It is fastened by a girdle and comes down to the knee. The covering of their head is also black. In this particular they do not differ from the Maronite monks in mount Lebanon, except in the shape of their garments. This color was common to both sexes. But I observed that while the married females wore a black fillet round a white head dress, that of the unmarried was wholly white.

The superior as I have called him, (the people called him Kotchek), wore a curious girdle composed of brass rings some four inches in di-ameter, firmly lashed to each other by black cords wrapped round the sides of the two rings that are in contact. One or two who came af-terwards to the feast wore similar articles of dress. The dress of the Yezidees in general resembles that of the neighboring Koords with the exception that, whereas the garment of the latter is fastened close round the neck, that of the Yezidees is open for some distance down the breast, the two sides not meeting till they overlap each other near the girdle. The *popular* explanation of this difference is as follows. The devil is said to wear a large iron collar fastened round his neck,

with a large projection in front, and his loyal subjects leave that space open in his honor!

The language of the Yezidees is Koordish, or as it is called by the Koords themselves Kermanj, so that we found it difficult to obtain any who knew either Arabic or Turkish enough to act as interpreters. Still in such villages as Baasheka and Baazani the people speak Arabic, and in Sinjar, they are said to know it more, surrounded as they are by the Arabs of the desert.

The Yezidees have no books, and according to their opinion it is a sin for any of their people to learn to read. I asked one of them what would be the consequence if a Yezidee should learn to read. The answer was, What could we do to him if he should apostatize and turn Mohammedan? intimating perhaps that whatever punishment they might deem such a transgression to deserve, they had not now as formerly the power to inflict it. I have only heard of one family who can read, and they reside in the village of Baasheka, some twelve miles on the road from Mosul to Mar Mattai. Sheikh Adi itself seems to be the great centre of their devotion. At one time the Kotchek said, pointing to the temple, 'That is our book, we want no other than that.' And when asked what qualifications were necessary in order to be a Yezidee, he replied, 'If a man loves and honors Sheikh Adi he is a Yezidee.' This must have been spoken, though, as a mere excuse for not giving the true answer, for like the Druzes, whom they in some respects resemble, they do not allow any to become proselytes to their sect.

It may be asked, if the monks do not read, How do they spend their time? Their main business is to take care of the premises. Individuals of both sexes were engaged every day in sweeping, not only the temple but also the outer court, and indeed all the other courts, paths, etc., to a great distance around. Besides, when any one wishes to build a place in which to reside, during their feasts, he gives notice to the Emir, who gives orders to the monks, and the work is done by them. Besides this, it is their duty to repair any part of the temple or other sacred buildings that may require it. We saw a great many places that had been thus repaired, and at least as great a number that called loudly for attention. While we were there, the women were busily engaged in preparing fire-places and ovens of clay in the various cells for the approaching feast. Then they spin, cook and labor, as females generally do in the surrounding country.

The Yezidees are notorious for drunkenness, and the monks here seemed to be anything but free from this pernicious vice. One of them begged for a bottle which he saw in our canteen, as soon as we

should have used the preserves it contained, and when he obtained it, in the exuberance of his glee at such a valuable prize, he made no secret of the use for which he designed it. Still they do not give up all claim to monkish austerity, for when invited to sit with us, they were very careful to turn up the cotton quilt by means of which we sought to soften the hardness of their rocky floors, and to sit down on the Turkish carpet we had spread beneath it. The Kotchek, more thorough going still, in his ideas of retrenchment and mortification, folded both aside and sat on the bare stones. We should have suspected some idea of ceremonial pollution, such as forbids the Metawalies of Syria and the Shiites of Persia to use a vessel or eat food prepared by one of another sect, which is sometimes carried so far, that if such an one touches a mass of butter or honey they may have for sale, he must buy the whole, as henceforth it is unlawful for them to touch it. We saw nothing of the kind in use among the Yezidees to warrant any such idea.

They have three annual feasts, though after the most careful and repeated inquiry I could find no trace of a weekly Sabbath. The first feast commences on the last day of July or the first of August, and lasts about three days. The second and great feast occurs on the 22nd of September, and continues about five days. And the third, at the beginning of January, lasts generally three days, like the first. During these feasts there is said to be much music and dancing and similar revelry, but few religious observances. On the last Sabbath of our stay the people began to pour in to the first feast. Most fired guns as they approached, all were dressed in their best apparel, though I would by no means be understood as implying that their best was good. All was the coarsest and most uproarious mirth, and *keif* (pleasure), as the Arabs call it, became the order of the day. Probably 1000 men assembled before we left the place on the following evening. Jewish pedlars from Mosul transformed the long arches into little shops for the sale of coarse cottons and handkerchiefs or shawls for their headdresses; and divers musicians, with what we should call impracticable instruments, filled every nook of the valley with their horrible noise. The sheikh made an apology for the small number present, saying that the people were mostly now busy at home, but a much greater number would be there at the feast in September.

But it is time I should say something about the sheikh, to whom I have referred several times already. We had heard of him on the first day of our arrival; for one of our company who was just comfortably seated in a place that looked peculiarly inviting, was promptly warned that he was guilty of very great sin in occupying the place.

We were wondering in what manner the stones and clay had acquired such holiness, when they told us that that was the seat of their spiritual head whenever he came to Sheikh Adi, and no one else was ever allowed to occupy it. Finding that we readily gave way in this case, the same was said of other places, where I saw the common people lounging afterwards quite at their ease. On Saturday the great man came, accompanied by a crowd of servants, and was evidently an object of profound reverence to every Yezidee. His name is Sheikh Nasser (victor). He resides in the village of Assia, not far from Baadri, in the plain of Yezid Khan. His dress was much superior to that of any of his followers, and with his whole demeanor, served to betray the foppishness of the wearer. His servants were distinguished by variegated woollen belts thrown over one shoulder and fastened under the other, and the inmates of the place appeared in gayer colors than we had hitherto seen them. The sheikh was quite young, and neither impressive nor reverend in his appearance and demeanor. He either knew not how to read, or was an adept in the school of the father of lies, for when examining some Arabic books we had taken with us to improve the time, he pondered their contents with great gravity, while he held them upside down! And if they have any books, as notwithstanding all their protestations it is possible they may, (for they literally go astray from the womb speaking lies, and they are always liars as well as evil beasts when they have the power to be,) the fact that the Arabic alphabet is used in writing both Persian and Turkish, as well as Koordish when that is written, and also the Arabic inscriptions on the walls of their temple, and on the sacred arks under the conical domes, would seem to indicate that the same alphabet would be used in their sacred books. So that if he did not know Arabic letters, it is tolerably certain he knew none at all. But we will not dwell further on that.

At our first interview with him he gave us quite an idea of Yezidee politeness, by telling us that the men of the place knew nothing at all, or they would never have allowed us to come to such a sacred place. I could not help thinking that the poor fellows had been more faithful than he gave them credit for. But in spite of such an ungracious reception, Dr. Smith soon secured his good will by means of his medicine chest, and his entertaining account of the wonders of *Yengi Doonia* (new world), and he soon showed that, though he could not read, like the rest of them, he was an adept in the art of begging, by letting us know that he would prize the gift of our old Britannia teapot quite as much as though we had given him a horse. A hint which by the way we did not profit by.

And here, perhaps, I ought to make some apology for their seeming inhospitality. We had unfortunately arrived just on the eve of one of their great feasts, when it might not be so convenient to have strangers as eye-witnesses of their mysteries, and they were so addicted to falsehood with each other and so accustomed to it in all matters pertaining to them, that naturally they put no confidence in our repeated assertions that we should leave on the Monday before their feast commenced. We had told them that our horses would return for us on that day, but they never believed it, and were continually asking us when they would arrive. When they—thanks to the diligence of our servant—did come on the morning of the very day we had said they would, it seemed to be an exhibition of truth-telling almost too much for Yezidees or a Yezidee sheikh to credit, even on the testimony of their own eyes. Then, too, they were afraid that as M. Botta had bought up the village of Khorsabad and overturned the houses in his search for antiquities below them, so we were about to do the same thing with the ancient and venerated head quarters of devil-worship; a fear, which, as it was quite natural to people in their circumstances, justified them in doing their utmost to get rid of such dangerous visitors.

We had had a good deal of intercourse with the Kotchek before the arrival of the sheikh. He seemed, in spite of his fears, to be the most socially disposed among them. And as he hobbled about the court, attending to his duties—for he was lame—he would sometimes lay down his broom, and sit with us and drink a cup of tea, and on the strength of it, become quite communicative. At such times, he loved to dwell on the period when both the pasha of Mosul and the chiefs of Koordistan, quailed alike before the greater power of the sheikh of the Yezidees. Then, if any of them had a rebel village that they could not subdue themselves, they gave it to Shiekh Khan to see what he could do to bring them to subjection. And those who retired to rest in it awoke at midnight to find some of their number slain, the majority prisoners, and their property in possession of the dreaded sheikh. Then if a culprit fled from Mosul and took refuge with him, none dared to demand his return, and the merchant and his caravan paid tribute to the worshippers of Satan. He took peculiar pleasure in recounting this, as he called the ancient glory of his people. No doubt he thought within himself, that in those good old times, a couple of Franks would have met with quite a different reception had they dared to intrude on the solitudes of Sheikh Adi, when the sword was in the hand of his votaries, and his will was law in all the surrounding region. But if they abused power when they

had it, they have met with a bloody retribution. The celebrated chief of Ravendoose slew from 10,000 to 15,000 of their number, and twice partially destroyed their temple. After him, Hafiz Pasha carried off more than 30,000 as slaves, till the market was so glutted, even as far off as Samsoon, on the shores of the Black Sea, that Yezidee girls were sold there for thirty piastres (about $1,25) apiece, and the soldiers, tired of the burden of supporting them, were glad to get rid of them at any price. An English traveller in 1840, tells of the mangled corpses he saw lying unburied amid the ruined heaps of Nineveh, and Mohammed Pasha finished the work of devastation by the exorbitant demands he made of them, and the terrible vengeance he inflicted on all who dared to murmur or rebel. Twelve years ago, we could not have entered this valley, for it was then that the Ravendoose chief first began to punish their insolence. But now, however much the present generation may inherit the spirit of their fathers, they lack the power to put it forth in action. Sheikh Nasser is merely the religious head of his sect. The political power has been vested in an Emir nominated by the pasha of Mosul, ever since Mohammed Pasha slew the last of their once powerful chiefs.

As to their ceremonies I found it almost impossible to obtain any information. It seemed to be their rule to answer every question by a falsehood, and it was but seldom that the lies of any two agreed together. At one time when the sheikh had been asking a great many questions about our country and religion, the interpreter, who had talked very fluently till then, suddenly forgot all his Arabic, and could not understand one of the questions we wished in our turn to put to the sheikh, so that we were confined almost wholly to our own observations. Perhaps some information on this point might be obtained from the Nestorians of the district of Zall near Julamerk, who spend their winters here, assisting to take care of the premises, burning lime, working as blacksmiths, and clearing the snow from the roofs. This last must be rather a cold affair, for though the court is sometimes filled to the level of the roofs, and the whole mass must be cleared away, yet the Yezidees strictly enforce the rule that none shall enter the court without taking off his shoes. But it is doubtful whether any of them make any intelligent observation of what goes on around them.

We ascertained that 366 lamps are lighted every two nights, that is, 183 each night. The number, it will be observed, coincides with the number of days in the year; each of these is lighted in honor of some saint. I learned the names of a few besides Sheikh Adi, as Sheikh Shemish, Sheikh Yohanna, Sheikh Elias, etc. Some of these lamps

are placed in small structures of stone and lime, resembling in shape and size a dog-kennel, and burn two or three hours. But the rest are mere wicks, saturated with oil, and laid on the appointed place as soon as they are lighted, which of course are soon extinguished. While we were there they commenced lighting them half an hour before sunset, and did not finish till after it was quite dark. The lamps are first lighted in the temples where some are kept burning all the day, and then the appointed number is made up by lighting wicks in places scattered about the premises in every direction, under the arches and out among the trees. Sometimes a monk went before to light them, and one of the women followed, burning incense before each for a few moments as she passed it. But this was not done every night. In connection with this, it will be remembered that the smaller temple on the southern side of the valley is dedicated to Sheikh Shemesh, and whether you take the Hebrew שֶׁמֶשׁ, the Syriac ܫܡܫܐ, or Arabic شَمْس, all mean the sun. Jesus Christ, too, they style the light of God. Every morning, on rising, they go round to these black, greasy spots, and kiss them with the utmost reverence. At the same time they kiss the sides and threshold of the temple, but seldom enter. Generally they stand still a moment and raise their hand to their forehead before they stoop to kiss.

On the last Sabbath evening we were there, an old blind man, dressed like one of their priests, arrived. A female, who might have been his daughter, led him round the premises and pointed out the objects of their adoration as they passed them in succession. At one time he was close by me, and yet not aware of the presence of a stranger. He knelt down before one of the places of fire, and very reverently repeated a prayer in Koordish, of which I could only distinguish the words Sheikh Adi; then guided by his attendant, kissed the spot and went on. Poor man! I could not but pity him as he passed before me. His hand trembled in that of his guide, and as he followed her with a hesitating step, his eyeballs rolling restlessly, seemed ever straining to behold a god they feared to see. We had been sitting quietly in a sequestered nook by ourselves, where we enjoyed our customary services. Perhaps this was the first time the gospel had been read in this valley, or its rocky sides reëchoed the praises of Jehovah Jesus. But we had a sure and blessed hope that it would not be the last. That even, though long after we were dead, the religion of Christ would triumph over these orgies of the great adversary of God and man. We saw another illustration of their grovelling superstition in a Koord who came here to seek relief from a

nervous pain in the side of the head. A monk took some of the sacred earth from the spot where he stood, and moistening it in the equally sacred water of the fountain, anointed the part afflicted. Yet though the poor fellow lay about for several days, his pain became worse instead of better. Still he had such a belief in the virtue of the application, that he never once asked Dr. S. for the relief he saw dealt out to others. Will it be believed that little balls of this clay are actually sold to the people as a sovereign panacea!

The Yezidees circumcise their children, and in answer to our inquiries they uniformly told us that they baptized them, and that trine immersion was the general mode. This last led me to suspect that they might be trying to recommend themselves to us as somewhat allied to Christianity, and yet they also said that Sheikh Adi was one of the names used in their form of baptism. As to the mode, they said that infants were immersed as already described; but in the case of adults they only poured a handful of the water on the face. These adults, as the sect admits of no proselytes, must be those living at a distance who could not come to the temple before. And if this fact is not sufficient to prove that this is the only place where the Yezidees are baptized, (for the head man or Kehyah of Baasheka once told me, that in some cases water or even dust brought from Sheikh Adi was used at a distance from it,) it shows at least that they attach peculiar sacredness to the rite when performed here; else why is baptism in the case of those at a distance deferred so long? The head man of one of their villages once told me that every Yezidee must go some time or other to Sheikh Adi; that if he lived as much as twenty days' journey distant he must go.

As to Sheikh Adi himself, though he has given his name to their holy place, I could get no very reliable information. For while the Kotchek affirmed that he had built part of this very temple as far back as twenty ages (query, centuries?), others represented him as an omnipotent and omnipresent Being who was never incarnate. As one of the monks said to the servant, "All that he wills, whatever it be, comes to pass," this may be then a name for God, or it may be that an ignorant people, not distinguishing the attributes peculiar to the Creator from those that belong to the creature, have in their excess of devotion to some created being, possibly to Satan himself, assigned to him attributes which belong to God only. The term *Sheikh* among them corresponds to Mar among the Christians of the Syrian church, whether Nestorian, Jacobite or Maronite, and St. in English. For instance, the convent of Mar Mattai, so called by the Christians, is uniformly Sheikh Mattai among the Yezidees, and translated into

English would be St. Matthew. So the temple of Sheikh Yohanna at Sheikh Adi would be Mar Yohanna among the Christians. Some of the latter believe that in ancient times there was a church here dedicated to St. John;[1] others say that one of the apostles founded it and gave it that name, and they select Thaddeus—in Arabic تاداى, whence they say came Adai or Adi—as the founder.

Besides the ecclesiastical office-bearers already mentioned, viz. Sheikh, Kotchek and Rahib, I have heard of three others, i. e. *Kawal*, which, as near as I could learn, corresponds to our priest; *Peer*, the exact rank and functions of which I could not ascertain, and *Derwish*, to which they seem to attach a different idea from that which the Mohammedans assign to that word. But here again their contradictory answers rendered it utterly impossible to get at the definite rank and duties which belonged to it. The most probable account was that the order of dervishes corresponds to the order of priests among the native Christians, only that they never marry, and subsist on the voluntary alms of the people. Their principal duty is to take care of the tombs or temples that abound in every village of the sect, and this they are expected to perform gratuitously. These buildings go generally by the name of some sheikh in whose honor they are raised. They are square erections of stone and lime, with a dome rising from the middle in the form of a fluted cone. They are generally kept very neat and clean, and present a very fine appearance as one approaches their villages. Their neat white domes rise from the top of every eminence around the village which is likely to catch the first beams of the rising sun, or are embosomed in a little grove, where you can only see the top of the dome shooting up among the trees. Sometimes they are met with alone in the plain far from any village. Such an one is that of Sheikh Rustum, said to be very ancient, standing near the road-side between Baasheka and Khorsabad.

Their sheikh did not claim a very remote origin for his sect. He dated it no further back than the successors of Mohammed. May it not be that it rose contemporaneously with the Druzes, Nasairiyeh, etc., in the early part of the eleventh century, and like them broke off from the main body of Mohammedans at that time?

Still some of their ceremonies must be traced back to a much earlier period. But whether a new sect incorporated some of the doctrines and usages of the fire-worshippers to induce them to join it, or

[1] The Yezidee Kehyah of Baasheka said that the door leading out from under the dome at Sheikh Adi, (it was so dark we did not enter,) led into a room where was a stone with inscriptions showing that it was once a Christian monastery dedicated to Sheikh Hannah or Anna (St. John).

whether the old fire-worshippers conformed to the reigning religion in some particulars, so as to avoid persecution, is a question on which we need more light in order to decide. The name Yezd or Yezid, it will be remembered, is the name of the Supreme Being in the Zend-Avesta, as well as the name of a heretical Mohammedan. Or the sect may have been a colony from the city of Yezd in Persia, and have obtained it in that way. One thing seems settled, that the present creed of the Yezidees, so far as they have any, and the external organization of their sect, date as far back as the eleventh century, and how much further future investigations must determine. How much of Manichaeism has entered into its composition; whether the doctrines of Zoroäster or Mohammed form the main body of its tenets; these and similar questions can only be answered when we know more about them. The Kotchek seemed disposed to claim relationship with the Druzes on the faith of the report of a Mosulian who had been in Mt. Lebanon. But he evidently knew next to nothing about them, and the sheikh knew still less. They averred, however, that there were many Yezidees in Persia and some in Damascus. Query—Are the Guebres of Persia the Yezidees here spoken of?

As for their reputed worship of the devil, it is true that they will not endure to hear his name mentioned, and will by no means repeat it themselves or even anything that resembles it in sound. To such a degree do they carry this that they never utter the usual name for the Tigris near Mosul, ال شاط, from its resemblance to شيطان, nor even نعل, the name of a *horse-shoe*, because it resembles لعن (*curse*), one of the works or attributes (it is hard to say which) of Satan the accursed. Still they say they do not worship but only honor ملك طاوس,—(Melek Taoos) or *king Peacock*, the *sobriquet* with which they honor his satanic majesty, or rather the *alias* under which they make mention of him,—as a servant whom his master is now displeased with, but will one day restore to his ancient honors. Said one of them in justification of this rendering honor to Satan: "I am a servant of the pasha. Suppose that I know that one of his officers now in disgrace, will one day be restored to favor, ought I not to befriend and honor that officer during his temporary disgrace?" They also justify their attachment to him by the assertion that Melek Taoos so loved Christ, that he snatched the arrow from a Jew on one occasion who was about to kill him; and when he was about to be crucified he conveyed him away, and substituting an image in his stead, thus saved him from death. The Son of God, they say, cannot die. I need not here remind the biblical student of the heresy of

the Gnostics already, as is probable, manifesting itself before the death of the beloved disciple, who in his first epistle speaks of "the blood of Jesus Christ his Son," 1: 7, and again, "Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God," 4: 2. See also ch. 4: 15 and 5: 6.

In defence too of their belief that it is a sin to read, one of them observed, "You dishonor the word of God by putting it into the hands of children who tumble it about and treat it irreverently. You put it in the market to be sold like any other piece of merchandise. We honor it by forbidding any one to read it out of the family of our sheikh. It is too honorable, too sacred, to be touched by any other hands."

If Tractarians and Roman Catholics find themselves here sitting side by side with devil worshippers, I cannot help it, I am only repeating their own declarations. These worshippers are certainly more thorough going than some sects in admitting the devil and all his angels to a seat in heaven, as well as the finally impenitent.

This sect is now so reduced, and their sacred place is at such a distance from their villages, that its inmates are constrained to hire the head of a neighboring Koordish village to defend them from the depredations of the mountaineers, and he told us that they worshipped Melek Taoos under the figure of a bird with only one eye. But the sheikh insisted that they had no images, that it was sinful to make them, for how could matter represent a spirit? just so difficult is it to get at the truth. They defend their worship of the sun by saying that they adore it as an emblem of Christ, the light of God.

I must not omit to mention an occurrence that took place on the last night of our stay, after the people had begun to assemble for the feast. After midnight we heard a loud and rapid lamentation, uttered very passionately as though one was in extreme terror from the sight of some present and inevitable doom, interrupted by frequent bursts of weeping. It began at a distance, gradually came nearer and finally entered the temple where the same sounds continued for some time. I could compare it to nothing but the passionate remonstrances of a Hindoo widow, as she was forced to ascend the funeral pile, now and then broken in upon by a burst of despair as her inhuman tormentors still urged her forward. But on inquiry in the morning, we could only learn that it was part of their religious observances.

While we were there we climbed several times to the top of the mountains that surround the valley, and could plainly distinguish the snowy summit of the range near Ashetha, bearing north 7° east. But the plain of Mesopotamia was so obscured by the hazy atmosphere of

summer, that we could not distinguish Mosul, though high enough to have had a fair view of it had the atmosphere been clear. It seemed like entering another world to exchange the withering blasts of the plain for the invigorating air of the mountains. During our stay there the thermometer averaged 75° in the morning, 85° at noon, and 81° in the evening. To us, accustomed to a temperature that for some weeks had seldom been as low as 100° at noon, it seemed like the refreshing coolness of a spring morning in our native land.

The Yezidees were heartily glad to see us leave on Monday evening. We reached Mosul on the forenoon of the next day, having rested about three hours at Khorsabad.

ARTICLE IX.

REVIEW OF RECENT EDITIONS OF CLASSICAL AUTHORS.[1]

Furnished by an Association of Teachers.

Among the serious disadvantages to which the editors of the higher classics in the United States are subjected, is one which results from the inadequate preparation of the student for college. From a variety of causes, many lads join a collegiate institution without an accurate acquaintance with the grammatical principles of the classical languages. Passing one or two years with a private teacher, or in an academy, possibly with frequent interruptions, they repair to the higher Seminary, where, instead of entering on a course of elevated classical reading, they are compelled to study the elements, and to plod over a weary and unprofitable course, without ability to enjoy the delightful entertainments which might be spread out before them. The student should employ the four collegiate years, so far as they are de-

[1] Titus Livius. Selections from the first five books, together with the twenty-first and twenty-second books entire. With English Notes for Schools and Colleges. By J. L. Lincoln, Professor of Latin in Brown University. New York: D. Appleton and Co. 1847, pp. 329.

The Germania and Agricola of Caius Cornelius Tacitus, with Notes for Colleges. By W. S. Tyler, Professor of the Greek and Latin Languages, Amherst College. New York and London: Wiley and Putnam. 1847, pp. 181.

Xenophon's Memorabilia of Socrates, with Notes. By R. D. C. Robbins, Librarian in the Theological Seminary, Andover. Andover: William H. Wardwell. 1847, pp. 417.

voted to the classics, in canvassing the higher points of grammar and philology, and in becoming familiar with the principles of rhetoric, philosophy and morals, so far as they are legitimately connected with the study in question. The rudiments ought to be mastered at an earlier stage. In studying a piece, like the Oration on the Crown, when the whole time of a student is needed to investigate questions of law, of history, of legal antiquities, etc., the weightier matters must be neglected or passed over lightly, because common grammatical constructions are not familiar, at least to a considerable portion of a class. Three years, instead of one year or one year and a half, are imperatively demanded in the preparatory course. It is folly to expect that classical studies will ever flourish in the United States, till parents and guardians are wise enough *to insist* upon this fundamental preparation in the case of their children and wards, and until *numbers* cease to be the main test of the prosperity of a literary institution. When the quality of the education, not the number of those who are enrolled or matriculated, comes to be the distinguishing characteristic of a seminary, be it preparatory, collegiate or professional, then there will be an adequate motive and encouragement for putting out able editions of the profounder treatises of the masters of ancient wisdom.

Another serious disadvantage which the editors of the classics experience, is the want of large libraries. This,—which is almost the first necessity of a collegiate institution,—is not unfrequently the last which receives earnest attention. Spacious and sometimes not very sightly edifices are erected at great expense, professorships are founded, large collections in natural history are secured, observatories are built, while the library presents a most meagre aspect of empty shelves or of worthless duplicates. Means are provided for studying the heavens and the earth and the regions under the earth, while the records of man's intellectual and moral history are unknown or uncared for. That all the departments should be filled with able and accomplished teachers is an obvious and well understood proposition. But the relation between ability in a professor and a goodly library is not so much pondered. It is forgotten that a great and valuable library is the *genius loci*, the guardian spirit around a literary institution, the inspirer and nurse of generous purposes and high resolves. What has a more quickening influence upon an ingenuous scholar than the well ordered files embodying the wisdom and learning of past ages! The dusty alcove, the time worn parchment, the brazen clasp, the uncouth device, are full of thought and stirring reminiscences. What, on the contrary, can be more depressing than the sight of an ill-furnished, ill-assorted, poverty-stricken library? It is a great shop with-

out any tools, a vast laboratory unprovided with an instrument or a machine.

Besides, properly to edit a classical author requires an apparatus of books which is utterly beyond the means of most of our scholars. All the original sources of information, all the preceding editions, good, bad or indifferent, (for the poorest work may supply, indirectly, valuable hints) ; all the historical, or antiquarian or geographical productions which may serve as sources for illustration, or clear up a doubtful point, should be within reach. As it is, the classical editor, in this country, must often depend on second-hand authorities; he cannot refer to the original source; he is unable to verify his quotations by the context of the original; he must run the risk of depending on a proof which perhaps was selected for another purpose. A difficult passage must remain unresolved, because no copy of the book which he urgently needs is nearer than Göttingen or Leipsic. No one knows so well as he, who would thoroughly accomplish a task of this nature, how many books are needed, and how important for his purpose that they should be easily accessible.

The founders and patrons of many of the universities in Europe have entertained more enlightened views and proceeded on a wiser course. The buildings have been a matter of secondary importance; the library, Mss. and other literary treasures are secured by all means and first of all. The Royal Library in Berlin, e. g., is an unimposing building with no pretensions to beauty, yet it contains about half a million of books, and nearly five thousand manuscripts. The university of Heidelberg is a plain and comparatively small edifice, yet it has one hundred and twenty thousand volumes and many inestimable manuscripts.

Another disadvantage results from the want of earnest sympathy and of fraternal coöperation. With honorable exceptions, the classical teachers in our country, labor independently, and without much substantial aid or active sympathy from those engaged in similar pursuits. Nothing exists among them, like that bond of hearty union which connects the students in the natural sciences. These are really citizens of a scientific republic, where kind wishes and effectual aid are not limited by oceans, or by dissimilarity of language or manners. This estrangement of feeling, or rather the want of earnest sympathy among the great body of our classical teachers, is owing to ecclesiastical barriers, or to ignorance, or to unfounded prejudices which mutual acquaintance would dissipate, or to the pressure of personal duties real or supposed. Whatever may be the cause, the effect is to be deplored. Rival and hurried editions of the same book are published.

An editor, urged possibly by the representations of those who may have a pecuniary interest, neglects to compare his views with those of other scholars and publishes a volume which may be disfigured by serious mistakes, or which furnishes few evidences of the *limae labor et mora.* Another consequence of this want of cordial coöperation is seen in the indifferent quality of our literary criticism. The notices and reviews of classical works, with a few marked exceptions, are brief and superficial, composed of exaggerated praise or indiscriminate censure. It is sometimes forgotten that one of the best evidences of real friendship which can be given, as well as of paramount regard to the interests of truth and learning, is fair and impartial criticism. As it is, many of our professed critical notices must be regarded as the work of a partial and friendly writer, who had little leisure, or inclination, or ability, to go into the subject with thoroughness and discrimination. In this way the general standard of scholarship is depressed; classical learning is undervalued, and sometimes, as in the case of ill-considered censure, unscholarly and unchristian feelings are fostered. Still it should be remarked that there are some indications of the prevalence of a better method. The scientific and searching criticism, which characterizes German scholarship, is gradually introducing a change in this particular.

We may further remark that the serious disadvantages to which our classical scholars are subjected, are relieved by some things of a contrary nature. If there are few authorities or sources for reference, there may be greater self-reliance and a more independent judgment. Where consultation is impossible and desired literary helps are denied, the powers of invention may be sharpened, and the mind, thrown upon itself, may act with an energy impossible in other circumstances. Our very loss may be followed by gain. Compelled to study the naked text, we may ascertain the true sense by a careful comparison of the author's own words, or by an instinctive tact or feeling. If copious commentaries and ingenious emendations are not at hand, we may reach the same results by the road of history, or by comparison of different and distant sources of proof. More striking illustrations than are found in the books, or in modern editions of the classics, may be disclosed in the fields of geography or topography as they are now explored. By means of the commercial and missionary enterprise, which so much characterizes our times and our own country, new light is thrown both upon the classical and sacred page. We do not possess libraries or manuscript treasures, but we may send out living and learned explorers. American travellers and missionaries, impart, by their researches, a new significance to the pages of Josephus and Philo,

and to parts of the writings of Herodotus and Xenophon. As the missionary agent enters upon his field of labor in the central portions of Asia Minor, in Macedonia, in the countries around the Black Sea, and in other regions, we may anticipate still richer discoveries.

Again, if libraries and manuscript authorities are denied us, we may find a substitute, in part at least, by personal study and examination. Some of our professors and teachers have added to their qualifications for editing the classics by visiting the scenes where the great writers of Greece and Rome lived and died—scenes made immortal either as the cherished homes of genius, or by delineations to whose truth and felicity two or three thousand years have borne witness. The actual sight of a place not only serves to correct mistakes and add to the positive amount of knowledge, but imparts a vividness and freshness to a thousand objects seen before only in dimness and shadows. No one can follow Virgil, without a new sense of his tenderness and grace, from the "dulcia arva," near Mantua, to the beautiful valley of the Clitumnus, where the rivulet springs clear from the limestone rock, or to the hill where the Tiber must have first caught his eye, "multa flavus arena," or to that other hill, overlooking the Campus Mavortis, where the same river glides "leni flumine" by the "tumulum recentem" where the young Marcellus was laid with many tears, or down to sweet Parthenope and the "sedes beatas" with their purple light and eternal spring. Who can gaze, without a fresh interest in Livy, on Padua and the adjacent regions, on the battle-field at the lake Thrasimene, "loca nata insidiis," or on the "clivum Capitolinum," and the thousand objects around more wondrous in their decay than in their former glory? What a reality is given to the descriptions of the lyric poet by the sight of Soracte, still covered with its wintry crown of snow, of the Sabine hills, of the "praeceps Anio" at Tivoli, of the Vatican with its "playful echo," of the Via Sacra, or of Terracina "impositum saxis late candentibus?" No one can wander over the Roman forum without feeling a new force and reality in the words of the great orator, who, as he spoke, was surrounded with everything fitted to illustrate his sentiments and inflame his eloquence.

The same remarks are applicable, in a greater or less extent, to Athens and Greece. Exact local knowledge illuminates the page of the ancient classic and historian; we see new reasons to trust in the honesty of their descriptions and to admire the felicity of their diction. Sometimes a single word is a picture; a little paragraph or stanza imprints on the memory and imagination a scene which actual sight confirms and illustrates. The teacher, who has gazed on these consecrated spots, can never forget them, and will find the knowledge thus acquired

invaluable whether in oral instruction, or in the reproduction in print of the classic page.

The want of a good school edition of Livy, which had been felt for several years, is now supplied by the valuable work of Prof. Lincoln. The present edition has appeared under the most favorable circumstances. The text of Livy had been very unsatisfactory; little improvement had been made in it since the time of Drakenborch. For the purpose of improving it, Car. Fred. Alschefski, a distinguished German scholar, with great patience and perseverance had collated the most valuable manuscripts of Livy, particularly the Paris and Florentine, and as the results of his investigations has furnished a text as far as the thirty-fourth book with important emendations. His text of the first decade was very critically examined in two long and elaborate articles by Prof. Weissenborn, of Eisenach, who in a spirit of candor, adduces reasons for rejecting some of the readings of Alschefski and for substituting different ones. Various other articles, too, had been written on the emendations of Livy, some of which had been reviewed by Alschefski himself. Such was the rigid scrutiny to which the text of a portion of Livy had been subjected just before the present edition was commenced, and such the materials accessible. Prof. Lincoln, too, had just enjoyed the advantages of several years' study in Germany, where he had prosecuted still more extensively his classical studies. He had also visited Rome and other principal cities of Italy and made himself familiar with the localities which are so constantly occurring in the author before us. These are the peculiarly favorable circumstances under which Prof. Lincoln entered upon the preparation of the present edition of Livy; and the result cannot have disappointed the high expectations that might have been reasonably entertained.

The text, which embraces 194 pages, consists of selections from the first five books, together with the twenty-first and twenty-second books entire. The notes occupy 108 pages, and are followed by a geographical index, and also an index to the notes. Two valuable maps accompany the volume, one exhibiting the route of Hannibal over the Alps; the other is a plan of Rome according to Becker. Instead of "selections" from the first five books, we think two or three of the first books entire would have been preferable. With the portions selected there can be no fault; if any selections are to be made, they are probably the best. But it is our decided conviction that the student will know more of Livy as a writer and a historian by reading one or more books continuously, than by reading the same amount of

extracts. The twenty-first and twenty-second books very judiciously make a part of the text. They contain an account of the bold adventures of Hannibal in crossing the Alps and of his wars in Italy with the Romans, forming the most interesting parts of the Second Punic war.

The notes illustrative of the text give evidence that the editor has well understood his author, and judiciously appreciated the general wants of the student. He has not done for the student what the student should do for himself; he often refers him to sources where information may be obtained on points which need elucidation, leaving him to make his own investigations, instead of having everything carefully drawn out and adjusted for him. While the notes illustrate sufficiently the geography, history and antiquities, they are particularly full on the grammatical construction of the language. This is as it should be; for the development of the genius and idioms of the language have been far too much overlooked both in our editions of the classics and in our systems of teaching. Of the grammatical subjects treated in the notes, the attention devoted to the modes and tenses deserve to be particularly mentioned. The remarks on these are not merely in the shape of abstract canons; they are of such a nature as to bring out the shade of thought as it lay in the mind of the author. Nothing can be more valuable than this. The student needs to be able to view objects from the same point of observation as the writer himself did. But how can he do this, until he can understand the force of the terms or symbols by which the author describes his own position? There are delicate shades of thought, particularly in languages as philosophical as the Latin and the Greek, which can be fully detected only by a nice appreciation of the force of the modes, tenses, particles, position of words and sentences, etc. We give a few specimens of the happy and thorough manner in which the editor treats the subject of modes and tenses. On page 200, he is illustrating the use of *ausi sint*, in the sentence *tantum—creverant—ut—ausi sint*, and remarks that according to the rule for the succession of tenses, the imperfect *auderent* would be used here. He then "proposes the following rule as applicable to the present passage, and many others in which the Perf. Subj. in a clause denoting a *consequence*, follows a past tense. The Imperf. Subj. is used when the writer proceeds in the *historical order*, from the *cause to the consequence*, and wishes to represent the latter as resulting from the former. The Perf. Subj. is used when, on the contrary, the writer *argues from* the *consequence* back to the *cause*, and states the latter in order to determine and establish the former. To illustrate in the present instance: Livy does

not intend to represent *historically*, the fact of one daring to attempt hostilities against the Latins as a *consequence* of the increase of their power, but rather to state that fact, in order to make clear to his readers how greatly that power had increased ; in other words he does not develop, *historically*, the consequence out of the cause, but rather, *speculatively* establishes the cause, by stating the consequence. Hence the Perfect. On the other hand, in the very next sentence, Livy uses the Impf. *esset*, because he there wishes to represent *historically*, the settlement of the boundary, as the *consequence* of the peace, which has been agreed upon."

Cujus — venissent, page 205. "Livy wishes to represent the parents themselves as *declaring that they had come* to the festival; if he had simply intended as a writer to mention the *fact of their having come*, he would have said *venerant*."

Quia — factum est, quam quod — diminutum sit, p. 227. "*Quia* and *quod* both denote a cause, but Livy in using *quia* with the indicative *factum est*, gives a cause which he himself holds to be the true one; and in using *quod* with the subjunctive *diminutum sit*, a cause which is alleged by some one else, or a merely supposed cause. We must ascribe, he says, the origin of liberty to the *fact* of the consular government being made an annual one, rather than to the *alleged circumstance* of any falling off of the power which the kings had possessed."

Duxissent — judicaverint, p. 304. "We have the Pluperf. and the Perf. both in dependence upon *facturum esse*. But Livy seems to have used the Pluperf. *duxissent* and the Perf. *judicaverint*, because it was in accordance with the feelings of the Neapolitans and with the style of their present address, to express by *dux.* something already *past ;* and by *judic.* to give to the conception as much *actual reality* as possible."

Notwithstanding the fulness and pertinence of Prof. Lincoln's grammatical illustrations, there are still other points to which the attention of the student might have been profitably called ; such as the general omission of *ut* in the oratio obliqua, the change from the subjunctive to the infinitive in the same kind of discourse, according as the idea to be expressed contains a command, or is a mere statement in the narrative form (see page 12, line 30, *mollirent*, etc.) ; on what principle *ne* after words of *fearing*, loses its original force and acquires the meaning of *that* (p. 18, l. 14) ; the force of questions made by such particles as *ne nonne*, etc. These points and many others might have been touched upon without any material increase of the size of the volume, and thus new and interesting features of the language

would have been brought before the student, the very existence of which he might never have observed. It is not sufficient that all these principles may be found in the grammar; few students will apply them unless their attention is called particularly to them. A valuable service would also have been rendered, if the editor had adverted occasionally to the use of new words by his author, and the revival of old ones. Some few words used almost exclusively by Livy are given on page 223.

We have noticed a very few statements, in regard to the correctness of which there may at least be ground to doubt. On page 205, line 4, *ecquis* is said to be compounded of *en* and *quis*. The best among the more recent authorities, however, consider it as compounded of the strengthening demonstrative particle *ce* and *quis*, *ce* being changed before q, into *ec;* see article *ce* in Freund's Lat. Lexicon, also Hand's Tursellinus, Vol. II. p. 8 and p. 341. In the same paragraph, *ecquis* is said to give "to *direct* questions a negative meaning," i. e. that the questions in which *ecquis* is used imply a negative. That this is often the case is readily admitted; so questions asked by *quis* often imply a negative; but that *ecquis* does not with any uniformity imply a negative, may be shown by numerous examples; see page 78th of the present volume, ecquid sentitis, in quanto contemptu vivatis? Virg. Æ. III. 341, 2; Æ. IX. 51; Cic. in Cat. I. 8, ecquid attendis, etc.?

On page 201 is the following note: "*Cum legisset*, having made her a vestal. It is worth while to remark that this construction of *cum* with the Plup. Subj. is usually thus to be translated by the *Perf. active Participle.* So also generally the *Latin past Part.* with a substantive in the construction of Abl. absolute." The first part of this statement holds properly, only where the subject of the principal and dependent clause is the same. In the sentence, *Cum intonuisset, multitudo ipsa se sua sponte dimovit*, we cannot translate, "having uttered these commands in a voice of thunder, the multitude withdrew," for the verbs have different subjects, that of *intonuisset* being Appius. The second part holds only when the action indicated by the Abl. absolute, is performed by the subject of the verb standing in connection with the Abl. absolute. Hence in the sentence *foedere icto, trigemini arma capiunt*, we cannot translate, "having concluded the league, the three brothers take arms," because the action denoted by *foedere icto* was not performed by the *trigemini;* but in the sentence, *Dictator, recuperata ex hostibus* patria, in urbem rediit, we can translate, "the Dictator having recovered his country from the enemy returned to the city," because both actions are performed by the same subject.

On page 202, the 212th line of the second book of the Æneid is referred to for the purpose of showing that *agmen* has sometimes the sense of *together;* but such cannot be the meaning of Virgil. By the expression, agmine certo Laocoonta petunt, he simply means that "they go directly (in a straight course) to Laocoon." See Forbiger's Virgil; also Wagner, and Crusius' Lexicon to Virgil.

The remarks on *similis* and *dissimilis*, p. 210, seem to imply that there is ground for the rule often laid down, that these words, in relation to persons, take the genitive when resemblance of character is denoted, but the dative, when external resemblance is meant. No such principle we think can be well established. Cicero almost invariably uses the genitive of persons with these words, whether the resemblance be that of character or of appearance; in respect to things the genitive and dative are used without any difference of meaning; see Krebs' Antibarbarus, p. 727: also Dr. Siedhof in Bib. Sac. Aug. 1847, p. 422.

On page 311, in explanation of the expression *me dius fidius*, the editor refers to Zumpt, 361, Note, where *fidius* is considered an old form for *filius*, and the subject of some word understood, as *juvat*, and *me* as the accusative pronoun governed by it. The other mode of explaining this expression should have been referred to, at least. The latter represents the expression as arising from the intensive demonstrative particle *ce* changed into *me*, the same as *me* in *mehercule*, *mecastor*, etc. and *dius* or *deus* and *fides*. This seems to us the more reasonable explanation. See Freund's Lat. Lex., articles *ce* and *fidius;* also Hand's Tursellinus, Vol. II. p. 342; Krüger's Lat. Gram. 251, Anm. gives both explanations.

The work seems to have been printed with great accuracy. Only a few typographical errors have been noticed: p. 205, line 21, *venerat* for *venerant;* p. 256, l. 1, *οἰκόδημα* for *οἰκοδόμημα*; p. 275, l. 12, Georg. for Æneid; p. 280, l. 35, *agrees* for *agreeing;* p. 283. l. 27, *suo* for *sua;* p. 290, last line, *seen* for see n.; p. 295, l. 12, *tranversis* for *transversis*.

This volume gives cheering evidence that a higher tone of philology is appearing among us; and every friend of classical learning will welcome it as a valuable auxiliary in awakening new interest in the critical study of the Latin authors.

The Germania and Agricola of Tacitus, which Prof. Tyler has given to us in so attractive a form, are the most interesting of the writings of their distinguished author. The Germania, although containing some pictures too highly wrought, as well as some things about

which the historian had not sufficient information, has nevertheless been generally admired for the fidelity and exactness with which it is executed, and for the lively descriptions which it gives of the customs of the ancient Germans; and the Agricola, the plan of which was probably, to some extent, drawn from Sallust's philosophical history of Catiline, will ever be viewed as a model of biography.

The critical helps furnished by Prof. Tyler will give interest to these treatises and make the study of them still more profitable. The style of the author is very concise, sometimes obscure, making such helps particularly necessary. There are also idioms not found in the writers of the Augustan age, to which the attention of the student needs to be called; indeed, as the editor justly remarks, "few books require so much illustration as the Germania and Agricola of Tacitus."

Prefixed to the text is a spirited and well written life of Tacitus, which in addition to his biography, illustrates the difference between his style and that of the writers of the Augustan age, and the changes which had taken place in the language and habits of the Roman people. The text is mainly that of Walther, though other German editors have been consulted, and their readings adopted, where the sense or the usage of Tacitus seemed to require it. We have compared several of the most disputed readings with some of the best authorities, and in almost every instance find that the text has high authority in its favor. On page 36, line 5, we suppose that *ipso* is omitted before *solo* through mistake, as it occurs in a note on p. 124, where the passage is quoted.

The notes give evidence of having been prepared with great care and diligent research. The editor has had access to some of the best helps, and has made a judicious use of them. The notes, in a historical point of view, are all that could be wished; they are to some extent, also, grammatical; but we feel that in this respect they should have been much more full. Until the course of education in our preparatory schools shall be more systematic and thorough, and our colleges make higher demands of those whom they admit to their halls, so far as respects the accuracy of their elementary training, no editor who may prepare college editions of the classics, can feel himself warranted in dispensing with grammatical annotations. The editor has also pointed out in his notes the poetic and later or post-Augustan usage of the author. This is a valuable feature. It illustrates at once the connection between the change in the character of the people, and the change in their language. With their "simplicity of character," their simple and natural style disap-

peared. What the editor has so appropriately done with respect to the later and poetic idiom of his author, he might with great propriety and profit have carried still further, and have embraced the new words which were not in use till after the period of Augustus. New ideas or new modes of conception, require new words as well as new modes of expression. The age of Tacitus was marked by the introduction particularly of many abstract terms; it would have been well, therefore, to have pointed out such words as *conglobatio*, *dignatio*, *diversitas*, *irritatio*, *conversatio*, *jactantia*, *ultio;* so too *conjugales*, *ejectamentum*, *irritamentum*, *incuriosus*, *enormis*, *subfuscus*, *illacessitus*, etc., none of which were used till after the age of Augustus.

We will notice the few points in the notes to which we have taken any exception, although in regard to some of these there will doubtless be a difference of opinion among scholars. In endeavoring to settle the reading of the word *erumpat*, chap. 1, the editor says (p. 83) that others read *erumpit*. But to show that *erumpat* is the correct reading, he remarks that Tacitus oftener uses the subjunctive mode after *donec*, and in proof of it refers to *separet* in chap. 20. It would have been better to have referred to a passage containing an idea similar to the sentence in which *erumpat* stands, e. g. An. 2, 6. *Rhenus servat nomen et violentiam, donec oceano misceatur*, or to Germania, chap. 35. *donec in Cattos usque sinuetur.* The words *sinuetur*, *misceatur* here quoted, and *erumpat* of the first chapter of the Germania, are evidently in the subjunctive contrary to the usage of the best Latin writers, and are to be noticed as a peculiarity of Tacitus. But to corroborate the use of the subjunctive in these instances by referring to *separet* in chap. 20, or to *absolvat* or *faciat* in chap. 31, is, at the least, questionable authority. These last three words contain a future idea, or a degree of indefiniteness, and hence, if the present tense were used, the subjunctive would be expected in any author; but the three former words mentioned above, contain no idea of futurity, but express simple, absolute facts, and hence the subjunctive is a peculiarity. Besides, such a mode of settling the text is an unsafe one; for if carried out it would change the indicative in the sentence *donec — cohortatus est*, Agric. 36, into the subjunctive.

In explaining the word *perinde* (p. 89) in the sentence *possessione et usu haud perinde afficiuntur* (Germ. 5), the editor says it means "not so much as might be expected, or as the Romans and other civilized nations." According to this interpretation some ellipsis is to be understood. But Hand (Tursellinus, Vol. IV. p. 454), who is the very highest authority, says that, while the grammarians think there is some recondite ellipsis in such passages, he sees no cause or necessity

for it. He would therefore interpret the above passage as follows: "The possession of gold does not have so great an influence over the Germans that they can be said to be affected by it, i. e. they have no strong inclination for gold."

Perinde in the sentence *mare perhibent ne ventis quidem perinde attolli* (Agric. chap. 10) is defined on page 149, "*not so much*, sc. as other seas." This Hand would interpret as above: "That the sea is indeed disturbed by the winds but not greatly, i. e. that the sea is not greatly disturbed even by the winds."

Adhuc in the sentence *gens non astuta nec callida adhuc secreta pectoris licentia joci*, is explained (p. 108) "*to this day*, despite the degeneracy and dishonesty of the age. But perhaps = *insuper* or *etiam*." This is too indefinite. *Adhuc* is not unfrequently used in the sense of *adeo* (Hand's Tursellinus, Vol. I. p. 165), to give emphasis to a word, and here is to be connected with *secreta*, "they disclose the very secrets or even the secrets of their breast." The same explanation is to be given to *adhuc* in the passage, cetera similes Batavis, nisi quod ipso adhuc terrae suae solo et coelo acrius animantur (Germ. XXIX.). The editor (p. 115) makes *adhuc* here equivalent to *insuper*, *praeterea*, but remarks that Gruber makes it limit *patriae suae* = "by the soil and climate of a country *still their own*." But *adhuc* like *adeo* is sometimes joined with *ipse* to give it greater intensity, which we think is the case here; hence it can be rendered in the connection: "they are made more courageous by the influence of their very soil and climate even."

On page 106, ὥς with the accent stands for ὡς without the accent, the latter only meaning *as* or *as if*.

In remarking on the passage, plerique suam ipsi vitam narrare fiduciam potius morum quam arrogantiam arbitrati sunt (Agric. I.), the editor says (p. 136) "*ipsi* is Nom. Pl. as usual with the oblique case of the reflexive pronoun," and referring to Andrews and Stoddard's Gram. 207, 28. The remark here made as well as the statement referred to in the grammar, seem to us likely to mislead the student; or if they should not mislead him, they would certainly not enable him to understand the use of *ipse* in connection with the reflexive pronoun. Whether *ipse* is in the Nom. or in some oblique case depends on the thought to be expressed. If the subject of the verb is to be contrasted with some other subject, *ipse* is put in the Nom.; but if the object of the verb is to be contrasted with some other object, *ipse* is connected with the object, in such a case as the construction requires. In the passage before us, *ipsi* is in the Nom. because the writer wishes to say that most men thought it a mark of conscious in-

tegrity, that they themselves should write their own biography rather than that others should do it for them; but had it been his intention to say that most men thought it a mark, etc. to write their own biography rather than that of some one else, he would not have used *ipsi* in the Nom. but *ipsorum*, which would be in apposition with *suam*, which stands instead of the genitive. See Krüger's Lat. Gram., § 417 seq.; Ramshorn, § 157, 1, e; Kreb's Guide, 127; Madvig, 478.

The view which we have taken of the difficult passage, At mihi nunc narraturo vitam defuncti hominis, *venia opus fuit* (Agric. I.), is slightly different from that given by the editor. The note on this passage (p. 138) implies that Tacitus actually asked pardon for presuming to write the biography of Agricola, "he timidly asks pardon for venturing to break the reigning silence." On this passage, we would suggest in the first place, that the word *nunc* does not refer to the *point* of time when Tacitus is about to write, but to the present time in general, including that in which Domitian lived, being opposed to the past time implied in Ac plerique . . . obtrectationi fuit. In the second place, we suggest, that *opus fuit* is to be taken hypothetically, as in such phrases as *longum fuit*, 'it would have been better;' such a construction seems to be required by the following hypothetical *petissem*. The connection of thought would then be: former biographers were not under the necessity of making an apology even in writing their own biographies, but I at the present time (*nunc*), even in writing the biography of a man already dead, would have been under the necessity of asking pardon, which I would not have asked, had I not have been about to describe times so cruel and hostile to virtue. Tacitus does not say that he actually asked pardon, but only that in the times of Domitian it would have been necessary. The actual present i. e. the particular time at which he writes is indicated by the words, Nunc demum redit animus in Chap. 3. which justify the hypothetical view taken of *opus fuit*. This is the explanation given in Jahn's Jahrbücher for Philology, Vol. 42, p. 275.

We have noticed a few instances where we think the conciseness of the statement would prevent the student from fully comprehending it. This is a fault, it must be confessed, into which the constant reader of Tacitus would be very likely to fall. Thus (p. 100) "*Vel — vel* = *whether — or, merely distinctive; aut — aut* = *either — or, adversative.*" Some additional remark is here needed to make the distinction clearly understood, as, in the formula *vel — vel*, one may choose between any of the particulars named, e. g. vel pace vel bello, either in peace or war (just as he may choose); but in the formula *aut — aut*, if one is denied the other is affirmed, e. g. aut Caesar aut nullus, either Caesar

or nothing, if not Caesar then nothing, (only one can be true); see Key's Lat. Gram. 1444. The same feature of conciseness may be noticed on page 103. "Referantur. We should expect *referant* in another writer but not in Tacitus." Now in order that this may be well understood, it should have been added: and the *quae* which is now the subject of *referantur*, would become the object of *referant*. The objection to the note as it now stands is, that the student would be likely to infer, that *referantur* is to be translated as if *referant* were in its place, not imagining that any change of subject was intended. On p. 167 *nisi si* is said to be equivalent to *nisi;* but it is undoubtedly true that *nisi si* is stronger than *nisi*, and signifies *unless perhaps*, and is often therefore used in an ironical sense; see Hand's Tursellinus, Vol. III. p. 240.

As Tacitus, like Sallust, differs from other writers in the use of particles, the mode of forming and connecting sentences, and in the arrangement of words, it would have been well if these subjects had received some attention. A few remarks on these points would lead the student to discriminate more closely between the style of different authors. We close our remarks with many thanks to Prof. Tyler for this very valuable contribution to classical literature, hoping that he may give us other portions of the same author. The mechanical execution of this volume is worthy of the highest praise. We have seen no edition of the classics published in this country, which looks more attractive.

The next work, the title of which we have given at the head of this Article, is from the Codman Press, and is edited by Mr. R. D. C. Robbins, whose name is well known to the readers of this Journal. A few years ago the same press put forth this treatise with useful notes by Prof. Packard of Bowdoin College, a second edition of which has already been exhausted. We are prepared, therefore, to welcome the appearance of the new volume before us,—so beautiful in its mechanical execution.

In the language of Tully we may say: *multas ad res perutiles Xenophontis libri sunt.* They are works no less distinguished for their delicacy, simplicity and elegance than for their utility, and are indeed worthy of the exhortation which the great Roman added in respect of them: *hos legite, quaeso, studiose.* Like the writings of Plato, these productions of Xenophon may be considered as a splendid tribute to the wonderful genius and lofty morality of Socrates. The varied accomplishments of these two devoted disciples are conspicuous in all that has reached us from their hands, and we find them ac-

knowledging with gratitude the one source to which they were indebted. Acting, as they ever did, on the principles they had learned from Socrates, and constantly advocating them in what they wrote, they have thus made it necessary for one who would rightly estimate their own conduct and writings, carefully to study the character and views of their great master. All that can be known of Xenophon compels us to believe that his account of Socrates is the one from which the student should receive his first impressions of the philosopher. Thus derived, these impressions will prepare his mind for the idea he will receive of this sublime character, when he shall afterwards repair to

> "the olive grove of Academe,
> Plato's retirement."

First, Xenophon, the practical, then Plato, the imaginative. This is the order of nature.

We therefore thank Mr. Robbins that he has first given us "Xenophon's Memorabilia of Socrates."

The text is that of the German edition by Kühner of 1841. It seems to have been reprinted with care, and we believe few errors exist in it which are not corrected at the end of the volume. For his choice of this text, the editor deserves the highest commendation. It is a revision by one of the first Grecians now living, whose task was assigned him by Jacobs and Rost. They selected him to edit this work as a contribution to the *Bibliotheca Graeca*. How judicious an editor Kühner is, appears from the principles on which he proceeded in preparing this book and his edition of Cicero's Tusculan Questions.

In his commentary, Mr. Robbins has given proof as well of his sound learning as of careful and wide research. His work is precisely such, in its general features, as will secure to the editor the gratitude of thoughtful, earnest, and patient students, for whose wants the book was prepared. To this class of students, the present volume will furnish such aid and encouragement in the critical study of Greek, as few works yet published in this country are able to give. It will teach our young men what is meant by high and generous scholarship, as the kindred works of Pres. Woolsey and Dr. Lewis are now doing. We see with great satisfaction, that the philosophy, the allusions to history and antiquities contained in this book, as well as its grammatical and rhetorical structure, are all faithfully investigated. The selections from the works of the preceding editors are very judicious; and the authorities to which he refers in the various departments of criticism are names from which the best scholars would make

no appeal. The frequent comparison of the Latin with the Greek,—a province of every editor and teacher of the ancient classics, but which has hitherto been almost universally neglected in this country, forms a commendable characteristic of this volume. We hope it will not remain singular in this respect. As the work proceeds, the commentary is less extended and minute, not because the annotations are unequally labored, but in accordance with an excellent plan of the editor. By the first part of his work, he intends to prepare the diligent student himself to solve many of the difficulties which he afterwards meets, and intimates this by constant reference to what has preceded.

Some errors will be found to have occurred in the printing of the notes; but these are not often of such a nature as to perplex or mislead the intelligent reader. We have examined with care some seventy pages of the commentary, and on this portion subjoin a few remarks.

1. 1. 1, p. 172. *τίσι ποτέ.* With this use of an adverb of *time* after the interrogative in Greek might have been compared the use of an adverbial phrase of *place* in English and Latin. See on 1. 1. 20. So also the Eng. *ever* and Lat. *-cumque* are employed as a suffix to relative words. Page 173. *τοιάδε τις*, Eng. *something such.* This concurrence of idioms and in the case of numerals with *τίς*, is worthy of remark.

1. 1. 4, p. 176. "*οἱ πλεῖστοι*, Lat. plerique or vulgus." The former word is the term commonly used by Cicero in such a connection as the present.

1. 1. 5, p, 177. *Δήλον* [*Δῆλον*], *οὖν, ὅτι ἂν προείλεγεν* is given by "Patet igitur non eum *praedicere.*" The Greek requires *praedicturum fuisse*, as the editor has rendered it in English. An *censes* me *suscepturum fuisse*, Cic. Cat. Maj. 23. Same page. "*ταῦτα.* The Latin method of using the Sing. *hoc* is more logically definite, but the Greeks seemed to prefer to extend the thought by the use of the plural." Where the *plural* of the pronoun is used of *a general truth*, the precise form of the idea seems to be, *cases like this;* the use of *ταῦτα* when *a single fact*, is referred to, occurs infra 3. 6. 6, and is there well explained by supposing that the sentence as made up of several words controls the form of the pronoun. So too when the adjective is in the predicate. For a striking instance of this, vid. Hdt. Clio, 4.

1. 1. 11, p. 182. "*ἰδεῖν* here construed c. gen. of participle, to preserve a unity of construction with the parallel phrase *λέγοντος ἤκουσεν.*" An exact appreciation of this anomaly. Cic. also gives us Orat. pro Leg. Manil. 3, *appetentes* gloriae—atque *avidi* laudis fuistis,

where the use of the Adj. in one part induced the use of the participle in the other. So too, perhaps, ibid. c. 19 in hoc bello—[et]—in hoc imperatore esse. Comp. Virg. Ecl. 7. vv. 65 et seq. Page 184. *κόσμος.* To the valuable note on the philosophical use of this term, might have been added a reference to Plin. Hist. Nat. 2. 3, and Cic. de Nat. Deor. 2. 22.

1. 1. 18, p. 189. *potentium* for *potentiam.* Page 190. *περὶ πλείονος ἐποιήσατο.* We should have been glad to see here a strict analysis of this phrase, so frequent in our author. Comp. the English *to make much, more,* etc. *of.*

1. 2. 1. "*πάνυ μικρὰ κεκτημένος, having very little;*" better, *though he had very little,* the clause being concessive.

1. 2. 8. *εἰ μὴ ἄρα.* The exact meaning of these particles here is admirably developed, and the present note is one of many which show on the part of the editor a just appreciation of the subtleties of the discourse.

1. 2. 12. In the sentence beginning with "*Ἀλκιβιάδης,* the son of Clinias," an error in printing has destroyed the sense.

1. 2. 14, p. 202. *ἀπὸ κνάμου.* So also the material of which anything is made, or from which it is derived, is denoted by *ἐκ.* Comp. Anab. 1. 5. 10. Matth. Gr. Gr. § 373. b. obs.

1. 2. 15, p. 202. "*καὶ ὄντε οἵω προείρησθον,* Lat. *ac tales essent.*" This should be, *et quum tales essent,* as the editor has given it in English; or it should not have been separated from the foregoing.

1. 2. 24, p. 207. *πολλῶν καὶ σεμνῶν.* On this use of the conjunction—contrary to our own idiom—with numeral words and adjectives denoting intrinsic attributes, we here have a very acute observation. We adduce, as instances of the same usage in Lat. Cic. Orat. 1 in Cat. 4, *multis ac summis viris;* pro Leg. Manil. 16, *tot et tantas res.* This peculiarity is explained also by Zumpt, Lat. Gr. § 756, but we think less philosophically.

1. 2. 27. "*τῷ* is the *abridged* form of the Dat. of the indefinite pronoun *τίς.*" So Kühn. Larger Gr. § 33. The forms *του τῳ,* are plainly from *ΤΟΣ ΤΗ τό,* softened in meaning, and denoting something conceived of as indefinite.

1. 2. 29. *Κριτίαν μέν.* The use of *μέν* in this place is admirably and satisfactorily accounted for.

1. 2. 32. *Ἐδήλωσε δέ.* With this absolute use of this word might well have been compared the Aristophanic *δείξει it will appear,* Ran. 1261. In some instances, however, a definite Subjunctive may be drawn from the context; as, Anab. 2. 6. 21.

1. 2. 34. "speech." From the adjuncts of this word, we infer that the editor has here used it as a participial noun.

1. 2. 37, p. 215. *τῶν ἄλλων τῶν τοιούτων.* Given by *alia id genus.* We find in the lexicons *id genus alia* quoted from Varro, de Ling. Lat. 7. 7. Cicero uses, if we may trust our impression here, *alia ejusmodi.* In ad Quintum Fr. Ep. 2. 1. 1. 4, he uses *alius ejusdemmodi*, and in Orat. p. Marcel. 3, we find *res ejusmodi*, and in Lael. 12, *quidvis ejusdem generis.* Cicero sometimes, and then apparently by Graecism, uses *genus* in the Acc., but we think it is not his usage to employ it as above.

1. 2. 53. *περὶ πατέρων τε καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συγγενῶν τε καὶ περὶ φίλων.* On these words we have a somewhat long note based on Kühner's. The *τε* after *συγγενῶν* Morus disapproves, and he is followed by Schneider. Bornemann is unwilling to exclude it, and refers us to 3. 10. 5. Its repetition there, however, seems to have arisen from connecting the several attributive words *in pairs.* If the received text here be genuine, we see no difficulty in the literal version of the passage, *concerning fathers as well as other relatives and also concerning friends.*

1. 2. 55. "*Οὐ διδάσκων.* For the use of the participle to indicate design, see Kühn. Gr. § 312. 4. c." This should have been, For the use of the *future* participle, etc.; this use of the *present* participle being rare and here deserving a remark as constituting an exception to the usage referred to.

1. 2. 61. *ὠφέλει.* The analysis of the regimen of this word is exact, and the explanation of the secondary Acc. here will furnish a useful hint to the student.

1. 2. 61. *ἐάν τις φανέρος γένηται κλέπτων*, is rendered, "if any one is clearly caught in the act of theft;" which in Greek would be, *ἐάν τις ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ ἁλῷ κλέπτων.* Translate, *if it appear that one has stolen, if one be convicted of theft.* See Kühn. Larger Gr. § 310. Rem. 3; Matth. Gr. § 549. 5.

3. 1. 1. *Ὅτι δὲ τοὺς ὀργομένους—τοῦτο διηγήσομαι*, "for the ellipsis with *ὅτι*," etc. It is perhaps better to consider the expression as complete in itself, *ὅτι δὲ*, etc. being explanatory of *τοῦτο;* as infra 4. 7. 1, *ὅτι δὲ καὶ—νῦν τοῦτο λέξω.* Comp. also 4. 2. 1, *ὡς προσεφέρετο, νῦν διηγήσομαι.* This seems to be a favorite form of expression with our author in introducing a new fact, or in proceeding to establish something he has asserted. Comp. 1. 7. 2; 4. 6. 1; 7. 1. 1, and Cyrop. 8. 8. 8; 881.

3. 2. 7. "*λίθος*, etc. frequently used for the plural (collective)." The coincidence of the Greek and English idiom here deserves notice.

3. 3. 3. *Καὶ ὅς.* On this formula, often used by Xenophon, we

should have been pleased to see a full note. See on 1. 4. 2. This use of ὅς as a demonstrative, as well as that of the prepositive ὁ in the formulas, ὁ μέν — ὁ δέ, and in ὁ δέ alone in transition, is a relic of early usage and is treated of by Buttmann with great acuteness, Larger Gr. § 75, marg. note and R. 3. With καὶ ὅς, cf. ὅστε and on the connective particle here, see ibid. § 149, under the latter word. The Greek retained the form of the demonstrative, but softened its meaning; modern languages have modified the form in most cases and then appropriated it to the new idea; cf. Eng. *that, this, the;* Lat. *ille illa;* Ital. *il la.* But compare with the Greek our use of *that,* both as a demonstrative and a relative.

3. 3. 14. "Ἱππικοῦ, sc. τέχνης, horsemanship." This form of the Adj. would forbid an ellipsis of τέχνη, and the context shows that by τοῦ ἱππικοῦ, *the cavalry,* οἱ ἱππεῖς, are here designated. So supra 3. 3. 2.

3. 4. 9. "ἀμφοτέρους εἶναι προσήκει; cf. § 8, τὸ τοὺς κακοὺς κολάζειν — ἀμφοτέροις οἶμαι προσήκειν. The former is perhaps the more usual construction." These cases seem to differ essentially. In the former ἀμφοτέροις is the subject of the Inf., and the object of προσήκει is implied; in the latter, τὸ κολάζειν with its adjuncts is the subject of προσήκειν, and ἀμφοτέροις is its object. Had the article, which in this case is used before κολάζειν, been omitted, the difference would then be one of construction merely. The present form seems to have been chosen to avoid the ambiguity which ἀμφοτέρους would have occasioned.

3. 5. 10. τροφὴν καὶ γένεσιν; to the passage here referred to in Homer, might well have been added, εἰ ὑγιαίνει ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν, — ἔτι ζῇ; LXX. Gen. 43. 26; and *valet atque vivit,* Terent. Cf. Anab. 3. 2. 13, where the natural order of the idea is preserved.

3. 5. 11. "Εἰ δὲ βούλει (sc. ἀναμιμνήσκοιμεν ἄν), lit. if you please, let us," etc. If the ellipsis be supplied answering to this English, the verb must be in the "Subj. adhortative," Kühn. L. Gr. § 259, 1. a.

3. 5. 24. λανθάνεις με — ὅτι — λέγεις. This construction, so anomalous, is very admirably explained.

3. 6. 1. παῦσαι ἑλκόμενον, *to stop his being dragged,* is translated, "to withdraw him from being dragged." Perhaps σπάσαι was in the editor's mind.

3. 6. 4. "Ὡς ἄν τότε σκοπῶν, elliptically for," etc. This use of the participle with ὡς and ἄν, is idiomatic. Cf. Anab. 1. 1. 10, ὡς περιγενόμενος ἄν κ. τ. λ.; and infra 4. 4. 4, with ἄν. See Matth. § 598. 1. b. The construction above is *equivalent* to the resolution by means of the finite verb and ἄν.

3. 6. 11. "τῷ βουλομένῳ, *cuilibet* or *cuivis.*" So Kühn. ad loc. "ὁ βουλόμενος est *quivis.*" This is a competent, but not exact translation. We believe the Greek and Latin coïncide here only in τι βούλει and *quodvis.*

3. 6. 12. The choice of readings in this passage between σκώπτομαι and σκέπτομαι is made on sound principles. We are glad to see in this note and elsewhere, the name of Pres. Woolsey cited as an *authority* in matters of Greek criticism. The readers of Plato's Gorgias among us, will thank Mr. Robbins for availing himself of an opportunity to render this just tribute of respect to accurate and liberal scholarship.

We should be glad to adduce from these excellent notes many passages, which scholars will receive with unqualified approbation, but with a few words more we must resign the book to the grateful student.

Commentaries prepared in accordance with the principles which the editor of the present work has followed, will do much towards securing from our students that honorable place which is so justly due to the highest human wisdom embodied in a language which was moulded by the very laws of beauty. To the attentive study of these ancient treatises thus edited, we look with more confidence than to any other human means for the liberal and exact culture of our young men, and for the redemption of our scholars from the influence of that seductive, but vague and irreverent philosophy which already numbers among us many willing votaries. We wish the intrinsic worth of the best portion of classic literature were better and more generally known. In the writings of Plato, of Xenophon, fellow-disciples of him,

> "Whom well inspired the oracle pronounced
> Wisest of men;"

and in the works of Cicero, the admirer and often the imitator of both, many of the most important principles of morality which religion has sanctioned are distinctly brought to view; and some of the most awful truths which religion has revealed, are there shadowed forth. For reasons, to which we have already adverted, the "Memorabilia of Socrates" have a peculiar claim on the early and serious attention of the young student, whom we would further remind that the greatest of natural theologians learned his most valuable lessons from this book; and that the acute Cousin and the profound Jouffroy in stating what was the foundation of human belief could only enunciate in modern phrase the simple truth recorded here as having fallen from the lips of Socrates three thousand years ago.

This, we believe, is Mr. Robbins's earliest offering at the shrine of classical learning. We thank him that he has brought so valuable a gift with that modesty of manner and thoughtfulness of spirit, which are fitting in one who would edit *Xenophon the Athenian.* We ask to accept it as the earnest of future contributions; hoping that amid the duties of the honorable office he has been called to assume as the successor of the lamented Stoddard at Middlebury College, he will yet find leisure to aid by efforts like the present, the cause to which he now devotes his ability and his learning.

ARTICLE X.

MISCELLANIES.—THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY.

By Prof. B. B. Edwards.

University of Cambridge, England.

In All Saints' Church, opposite St. John's College, Henry Kirke White was buried. His remains are deposited on the north side of the chancel. On the opposite end of the church a white marble tablet has been inserted in the wall at the expense of the late Mr. Kirk Boott of Lowell, Ms. Within a medallion, in bas-relief, is the portrait of White, beneath which are some commemorative lines from the pen of Prof. Smyth of Cambridge. Mr. White's rooms were in St. John's College, near the eastern gate of the easternmost quadrangle. Trinity Church, a handsome Gothic building at the south end of Sidney street, contains monumental tablets in honor of Henry Martyn, Rev. T. T. Thomason, and of the patron and endeared friend of both, the late Rev. Charles Simeon. On Mr. Simeon's tablet are the usual dates, and the words, "For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and him crucified." So great was the hostility to Mr. S., in the early years of his ministry, that it was necessary for his friends to guard him in going to and returning from church. For many years before his death, he was universally esteemed and greatly beloved. His audience sometimes amounted to 2000 persons. His successor, the Rev. William Carus, who is also a fellow of Trinity College, is a clergyman like-minded, and exerts a very happy religious influence upon many of the youthful members of the university. He occupies Mr. Simeon's rooms near the chapel of Trinity College. Mr. Simeon's remains were interred in the Fellows' vault of

that chapel, near the monuments of Sir Isaac Newton, of Porson, and others. On a full length statue of Sir Isaac Newton by Roubiliac, are the words, "Qui genus humanum ingenio superavit." He is represented with a prism in his hand, in an attitude of profound meditation. On the tablet to R. Cotes is inscribed, "Post majorem illum Newtonum, societatis hujus spes altera." Prof. P. P. Dobree, an eminent classical scholar, who died in 1825, at the age of forty-three, is said to have followed "closely in the steps of Porson," viz. "in corruptis locis detegendis sagacitas," etc. A tablet is also erected in honor of Rev. John Wordsworth, "magni poetae nepos." Bacon's monument, who was a member of this college, bears the inscription, "Scientiarum lumen, facundiae lex, sic sedebat. Qui postquam omnia naturalis sapientiae et civilis arcana evolvisset, naturae decretum explevit." The chapel, begun by queen Mary and finished by Elizabeth, is an elegant Gothic structure, 204 feet in length. Trinity College contains about one third of all the students of the university. The library of the college is in a handsome hall, originally projected by Dr. Isaac Barrow. It is nearly 200 feet in length, 40 in breadth, and 28 in height, paved with black and white marble. The books are divided into thirty classes and placed in cases of oak. On the top of each case is a bust of some distinguished literary character.

King's College chapel is, however, the great attraction at Cambridge, and is excelled by few objects of art in England or even in Europe. Like Westminster Abbey and York Minster, one is never weary in gazing at it. "It is a work," said Horace Walpole, "that will alone be sufficient to ennoble any age." Begun in the times of the sixth Henry, what effects must this sublime structure have had on the susceptible hearts of the thousands who have meditated beneath its shade! It is a most wonderful combination of gracefulness with stability, of extreme lightness with massive proportions and architectural symmetry. The length of the chapel from east to west is 316 feet, the height to the top of the corner towers is 146½ feet. There is a second inner roof of stone, in the form of a Gothic arch, so contrived that it has no dependance whatever upon the walls, the whole weight being supported by the buttresses and towers. Along the middle of this roof stones are fixed perpendicularly, adorned, alternately, with roses and portcullises, each stone weighing a ton or more, and projecting beyond the other parts of the carved work. Between the buttresses are eighteen vestries, nine on each side of the chapel, originally intended for saying mass for the souls of the deceased. Of the twenty-six large windows, with which this chapel is supplied, twenty five are composed of ancient stained glass, the colors of which were very rich and beautiful. Some of them are now in the process of repairing at an expense, it is said, of £1000 for each window. Twenty-two of them rep-

resent about one hundred of the most interesting scriptural events. Oliver Cromwell was a member of Sidney Sussex College. In the Fellows' garden is a pear tree said to have been planted by him. Emmanuel College, in the south-east corner of the town, is celebrated as the college where John Cotton, Nathaniel Rogers, Thomas Shepard, Thomas Hooker, Francis Higginson, and others of the first emigrant ministers of New England were educated. John Eliot, John Robinson, Peter Hobart, Leonard Hoar, John Norton, William Brewster, Hugh Peters, etc. were also educated at Cambridge. John Wilson was a fellow of King's College. Charles Chauncey was a student of Trinity, and afterwards professor of Hebrew and Greek.* John Milton was a student of Christ's College in 1626. S. T. Coleridge joined Jesus College. John Rogers the martyr, Edmund Spenser and William Pitt were members of Pembroke Hall.

The university library contains, it is said, 200,000 volumes. Among the Mss. is the celebrated one of the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles, on vellum, given to the university by Theodore Beza, who obtained it from the monastery of St. Irenaeus at Leyden. Of the Catholic epistles, which it formerly embraced, nothing remains but a fragment of a Latin version of 3 John 11—15. The Ms. belongs to the seventh century. There are also about fifty volumes of Hebrew and Syriac Mss., which Dr. Claudius Buchanan brought from India. Among these is a Syriac Bible in two volumes, folio, written on vellum, in the Estrangelo Syriac character. The library has copies of the first editions of many of the Greek and Latin classics; also the greater part of the works printed by William Caxton, the first printer in England. The library was originally much indebted to three successive archbishops, whom Thomas Fuller denominates "powerful Parker, pious Grindall, and polite Bancroft." An elegant building is now erecting for the Fitzwilliam Museum, etc. in the Grecian style, with a portico of eight Corinthians columns, supporting a cornice and pediments. Various classical figures are sculptured in bold relief.

The Sorbonne at Paris.

The parliament of Louis XIV., in the age of Pascal, Corneille and Moliere, assembled one day, all the chambers together, at the request of the Sorbonne, and condemned to banishment three chemists, Bitaut, de Claves and Villon, who had maintained theses contrary to Aristotle; the Sorbonne gravely pronounced the punishment of death against any one who should afterwards dare to attack the Greek philosopher. At the same Sorbonne, from a passage in Aristotle ὁ νοῦς ἔστιν ἀύλος, *the soul is im-*

* Richard Mather, Thomas Parker, John Oxenbridge, Roger Williams and others were educated at Oxford.

mortal, it was maintained in an academical exercise, by five arguments, more or less, that the soul is a *flute*, that being one of the meanings of ἀύλος! In our days at this same Sorbonne, Royer Collard, Cousin and Jouffroy have lectured in philosophy, Andrieux and Villemain in literature and eloquence, Guizot, Lacretelle, Michelet and Quinet in history. The celebrated school of the Sorbonne, where now stands the College de la Sorbonne, was founded in A. D. 1253, by Robert de Sorbonne, chaplain of St. Louis. The rue de la Sorbonne, near the centre of that part of Paris which lies on the left bank of the Seine, begins at the rue des Mathurins and abuts on the place de la Sorbonne. Many monuments and buildings give a singularly original aspect to this quarter of Paris. At the bottom of the street is the hôtel de Cluny, begun in 1480, in part on the ruins of the Roman emperor Julian's palace of the baths. It was finished in 1505. The turrets and richly ornamented garret windows are very striking. It now contains a precious collection of antiquities. In it the section of Marat held its sittings in 1793. Those lofty, narrow, gabled, small windowed houses, which elbowed each other and clomb up in each others' faces, without order, were the College de Bayeux, College de Narbonne, and the collegium Sagiense. At present the inscriptions over the gateways are the only remnants of those institutions. On the 4th of June, 1629, the foundation of the present buildings of the Sorbonne was laid by cardinal Richelieu. Two Doric portals lead to a wide quadrangular court, surrounded by substantial buildings of simple design varying from three to five stories. In the southern transept of the church—not now used as a parish church—is the celebrated tomb of cardinal Richelieu, the *chef-d' œuvre* of Girardon, and one of the finest pieces of sculpture of the 17th century. It was before this tomb that Mademoiselle de Thou—sister of the great historian—whom the cardinal had ordered to be beheaded, exclaimed, "Lord, if *thou* hadst been here, my brother had not died!" Here also Peter the Great on his knees exclaimed, "I would give half of my estate to find out from thee how to govern the other half." The college forms a large court, sombre but grand, yet almost entirely destitute of architectural ornament. The professors have apartments here. The lecture rooms are inconveniently small.

Other Colleges in Paris.

The university of France, having the control of the whole subject of education throughout the kingdom, consists of twenty-seven academies. The academy of Paris consists of five faculties, Sciences, Letters, Theology, Law and Medicine. The first three are established at the Sorbonne. The list of professorships and incumbents in these is as follows.

Sciences.

M. Leverrier, Math. Astronomy.
Poncelet, Physical and Exper. Mechanics.
Libri, Probabilities.
Biot, Physical Astronomy.
Sturm, Mechanics.
Lefébure de Fourcy, Calculus.
Francoeur, Higher Algebra.
Pouillet, Physics.
Desprez, Physics.

M. Dumas, Chemistry.
Balard, Chemistry.
Ducrotay de Blainville, Zoölogy.
Milne Edwards, Zoölogy.
De Mirbel, Botany.
Aug. St. Hilaire, Vegetable Organography.
Delafosse, Mineralogy.
Constant Prévost, Geology,
and five assistant professors.

Letters.

M. Boissonade, Greek.
Le Clerc, Latin.
Patin, Latin Poetry.
Villemain, French Eloquence.
St. Marc Girardin, French Poetry.
Garnier, Philosophy.
Cousin, Hist. of Ancient Philosophy.

M. Damiron, Hist. of Modern Phil.
Lacretelle, Ancient History.
Guizot, Modern History.
Guigniaut, Geography.
Ozanam, Foreign Literature,
and twelve assistant professors.

Theology.

L' Abbé Maret, Dogmatics.
Receveur, Morals.
Jager, History, and Eccl. Discipline.
Icard, Eccl. Law.

L' Abbé Glaire, Holy Scriptures.
Bargès, Hebrew.
Cœur, Sacred Rhetoric,
with five assistant professors.

The number of students attending the various faculties cannot be exactly ascertained. For the courses of law it amounts to about 3000; medicine, 2900; sciences, from 1200 to 1500. The library in the basement rooms of the Sorbonne, contains 50,000 volumes. It is principally used by the professors and students of the different faculties. All the lectures are gratuitous, and are also open to foreigners.

A few rods north-east of the Sorbonne, is the place Cambrai, opening upon the street Louis le Grand. Here is the Collége royal de France, founded in 1529 by Francis I. The present buildings, erected in 1774, of simple and elegant style, enclose three courts. The left wing contains laboratories for chemistry and lecture rooms; in the right wing are two semi-circular amphitheatres for lectures. In the upper stories are cabinets for natural science, and a library. At this college twenty-eight professors give public and gratuitous lectures. Among these we may name, M. Michelet, history and morals; Etienne Quatremère, Hebrew, Chaldee and Syriac; Caussin de Percival, Arabic; Desgranges, Turkish; Stánislas Julien, Turkish and Tartar languages; Eugène Burnouf, Sanscrit; Boissonade, Greek; Barthélemy St. Hilaire, Greek and Latin philosophy;

Nisard, Latin Eloquence; Tissot, Latin poetry; Edgar Quinet, languages of southern Europe, etc.

The Collége de Louis le Grand, which is termed, together with the four following, *royal* colleges, is situated at 123 rue St. Jacques, a few rods east of the Sorbonne. It was originally founded in 1560. It was many years in the hands of the Jesuits. It has 1111 pupils, of whom 522 are boarders. The terms for board in these colleges are 1000 francs a year, and 105 francs for college and university fees. The pupils of the various institutions and pensions are obliged to attend the royal colleges; and such as have private tutors are also admitted.

The Collége de Henri IV, in rue Clovis, in the rear of the Panthéon, has 850 pupils, of whom 486 are boarders. It is established in part of the church and other buildings of the celebrated abbey of St. Geneviève. The western side is of the 14th century. The sons of Louis Philippe were educated at this college. It is soon to be enlarged by the addition of the buildings occupied by the library of St. Geneviève. For this library—which is a rich and valuable collection of 200,000 volumes and 3000 manuscripts,—a spacious edifice is erecting in the place de Panthéon.

The Collége St. Louis, is a little north-west of the Sorbonne, and opens upon the rue de la Harpe. It was built in 1280, and rebuilt in 1675, though some part of the ancient structure still remains. The court is spacious; at the end is the chapel. The number of pupils is 980, of whom 350 are boarders.

The Collége de Charlemagne is at 120 rue St. Antoine, on the right bank of the Seine, a few rods above the Hotel de Ville. It was founded in 1582, the buildings of which formed the College of Jesuits, and are remarkable only for their great size. The attendance is 830 day pupils.

The site of the Collége de Bourbon is No. 5 rue St. Croix d' Antin, in the north-western part of the city. The buildings were erected in 1781. It has 1200 day pupils. There are besides, the two private colleges of Stanislas, 350 boarders, the Collége Rollin, 34 rue des Postes, 380 boarders; Collége de St. Barbe, 7 rue de Reims, founded by Jean Hubert, A. D. 1420, still one of the principal colleges of Paris, with 500 pupils, all boarders; and the Collége des Irlandais, 3 rue des Irlandais. The latter has a commodious edifice, forming three sides of a spacious quadrangle. It is devoted to the education of young Irishmen for the catholic church, of whom about twenty-five priests graduate annually. It is said to be in a flourishing condition.

The students of natural history in these colleges, as well as other persons, have free access to the unrivalled Musée d' Histoire Naturelle in the Jardin des Plantes. It is undeniably at the head of all the institutions of

the kind in the world. In the mineralogical and geological cabinets, the stranger is constantly filled with surprise at the size and value of the specimens; in orderly and effective arrangement, no people equal the French. The cabinet of comparative anatomy, collected and arranged by the immortal Cuvier, contains upwards of 15,000 specimens in eleven apartments. The number of species of plants, cultivated in the botanical garden, exceeds 12,000. On the ascent to a mound is a noble cedar of Lebanon, which was planted in 1735 by the elder Jussieu, and now measures ten and a half feet in circumference, at six feet from the ground. The gallery of zoölogy, contained in a building 390 feet in length, classed according to the system of Cuvier, comprises more than 200,000 specimens. The number of articulated animals, without vertebrae, are about 25,000. The arrangement begins with the lowest manifestation of animal organization, e. g. the sponge, and ends with man. The mineralogical, geological and botanical galleries have been recently arranged in a new building, under the superintendence of professors Brogniart and Cordier. The centre division contains the mineralogical and geological collection; the eastern division, the library, etc.; the western division, the botanical collections. On one side of the central division, are specimens of all known rocks and earths, arranged geologically; on the other, the fossils found in the various geological formations. The number of mineralogical and geological specimens exceeds 60,000. Among those which were noticed by the writer were a superb vase of brecciated porphyry, some remarkably beautiful specimens of yellow, red and white topaz, two large groups of colorless quartz crystal, a series of diamonds rough and cut, a piece of massive gold from Peru, weighing sixteen and a half ounces, a fine specimen of native silver from Mexico, etc. The botanical gallery has more than 350,000 dried plants, and more than 4,500 of woods, fruits and grains. The library consists of 30,000 volumes and 15,000 pamphlets. The manuscripts, accompanied with original designs, and the paintings of fruits and flowers on vellum, form an unrivalled collection. It was commenced in 1635, and now fills ninety portfolios, with upwards of 6,000 drawings, in value estimated at two millions of francs. In the centre of the hall is a marble statue of Cuvier by David, the inscriptions upon it being the names of his works.

Means for Oriental Study in Paris.

At the King's Library, No. 12 Rue Neuve des Petits Champs, near the Palais Royal, is the École des Langues Orientales Vivantes. Ten professors are attached to this establishment, and lecture publicly and gratuitously in the following languages: Pure Arabic, M. Rinaud; Vulgar Ara-

bic, Caussin de Percival; Persian, Etienne Quatremére; Turkish, ——; Armenian, De Vaillant de Florival; Modern Greek, Hase; Hindoustani, Garcin de Tassy; Modern Chinese, Bazin; Malay and Javanese, Dularier; Chair of Arabic at Marseilles (assistant), Eusébe de Salle.

The Société Orientale, meets on the 2nd and 4th Friday of every month, at No. 10 Rue Duphot. Its object is the study of modern oriental literature. It publishes the Revue de l'Orient.

The Société Asiatique holds its sessions on the 2nd Friday of each month at 7½ P. M., at No. 12 Rue Taranne, on the left bank of the Seine, near the church S. Germ. des Prés. The number of paying members, resident and foreign, is 249; three of whom only are our countrymen, Mr. Brown of the embassy at Constantinople, Mr. Haight of New York, and Mr. George Sumner of Boston. The number of foreign associate members is thirty-six. The president is M. Reinaud, secretary, M. Eugéne Burnouf, adjunct secretary, M. Mohl. The council consists of twenty-two of the leading members of the society. Its object is to encourage the study of the Asiatic languages, and specially, though not exclusively, the following: viz. the various branches of the Semitic, both in Asia and Africa, the Armenian and Georgian, modern Greek, Persian and its ancient idioms, Sanscrit and the living languages derived from it, Malay and the languages of the eastern Archipelago, the Tartar languages and the Thibetan, and the Chinese. The society also procures Asiatic Mss., makes extracts and translations, encourages the publication of grammars and dictionaries, enters into correspondence with societies and individuals engaged in like pursuits, etc. The Society has published a Journal from the beginning, which now makes fifty-two volumes 8vo.; viz. first series, twelve volumes; second, sixteen; third, fourteen; fourth, ten. The cost of the whole set in Paris, handsomely bound, is about 530 francs, or $106. The publication is one of high value for all who are engaged in oriental studies. From the Annual Report of M. Mohl, the secretary, read at the annual meeting in June, 1847, and from recent Nos. of the Journal, we translate a few notices.

"M. Stánislas Julien has commenced publishing in the Journal a series of articles, drawn from Chinese historians and geographers, and treating of foreign countries and nations. It makes us hope that he will follow the whole western frontier of China, and give us all the information which Chinese historians and travellers furnish on Tartary, Bactria, Persia and India." "M. Garcin de Tassy has accomplished his work on the rhetoric of the Moslem nations. Dulaurier and Dozon have inserted in the Journal their studies on the Malays. Defrémery and Cherbonneau have given a series of memoirs on the different Arab and Persian dynasties. Fresnel, Judas and Bargès have published and dis-

cussed the new Phœnician inscriptions; in short, you will receive in a few days the first part of a considerable work of M. Botta on the Assyrian inscriptions, which has for its object the classification of the characters and the determination of those which may be interchanged—a preliminary question which will be a great assistance for the entire experiment of solving the great problem of reading the inscriptions. This is the most beautiful of all the questions which at this moment occupy the learned. The object aimed at is to read the inscriptions in an unknown and complicated alphabet, and in an idiom of which one can only conjecture to what family of languages it belongs; but the importance of the result will sustain the zeal of the scholars who are occupied on this question; for the reading of these inscriptions, which are almost innumerable, will be an epoch in the study of ancient history, and the age which has seen the decyphering of the hieroglyphics and the Persepolitan inscriptions, ought not to despair in regard to any problem of this nature."

"The Asiatic Society of London has published three new numbers of its Journal, two of which contain the beginning of the fine work of Rawlinson on the great inscription of Darius at Bisitun. The author has given us the text and the translation of the inscription and the first part of his commentary on this magnificent monument of Persian antiquity."

In his articles in the Journal, M. Botta "proposes to demonstrate, 1st, That in the Assyrian writing, certain characters may be used, indifferently, in the place of certain others; 2nd, that the Assyrian writings at Van, Persepolis and Khorsabad, do not differ from each other; 3rd, that if the Assyrian writing at Van should differ from that at Khorsabad by a smaller variety of signs and by a more frequent repetition of the same groups, it is only because it has less employed the equivalents, and also from the fact that the same sounds are found more frequently represented by the same characters; and 4th, that the language employed in the inscriptions in these three localities is probably the same, for the pronouns, articles and grammatical signs do not differ." The work of Botta, as published by the French government, will contain 185 engravings, representing the designs of the bas-reliefs and the plans of the architecture, and 225 plates of Assyrian inscriptions.[1]

[1] M. Mohl justly complains of the cost of the works published by the French government, and which puts it out of the power of any one but the rich to purchase them. E. g. a copy of the Voyage of Durville to the South Pole will cost 1450 francs; the work of the Commission on the Morea costs 1800 francs; the two voyages of Texier, 1600 francs; the Journal of Flandin and Coste, 1400 francs; the work on Nineveh, 1800 francs; the Voyage to Iceland, 1825 francs. The engraving of the 225 plates of inscriptions in the work of Botta is said to be a useless expense because the royal press, where the text of the work is printed, has caused a font of Assyrian type to be cast, so that the inscriptions could have been printed in the text.

The second edition of the second and last volume of the Dictionary, French and Turkish, of M. Bianchi, for the use of travellers, consular agents, etc. in the Levant, has been published. Both volumes comprise 2300 pages. The work is said to be very satisfactorily done. The price is 60 francs.

The work on the History of Public Instruction in China from the third century to the present day, by Ed. Biot, is completed. It makes a handsome volume of 618 pages. It compiles and prepares from the original text the history of the higher and lower colleges established for moral and literary studies, also that of the special schools for the study of law, mathematics and medicine.

A valuable grammar of Hindoui was published in 1847, entitled, "Rudiments de la Langue Hindoui," by M. Garcin de Tassy, 8vo, price 10 francs. The Hindoui is one of the languages which were formed in India at the era when the Sanscrit ceased to be spoken. It is the language of the middle ages of those countries. It forms the transition between the Sanscrit and the modern Hindoustani, somewhat as the Romance language signalized the passage from the Latin to the French. The Hindoustani is the mixed language which was formed towards the beginning of the eleventh century, in the train of the Moslem invasion. The conquerors, having established themselves in the provinces where Hindoui was spoken, were necessarily compelled, in adopting the idiom of the conquered, to modify the grammar somewhat, to soften the forms, and to bring in a great number of Arabic and Persian terms. Besides, faithful to a system universally followed by them in all the countries where they have the preponderance, they compelled the use of the Arabic alphabet. The Hindi is the Hindoustani written in Sanscrit characters. The Hindoui was the idiom of the Hindoos before the Moslem invasion, used in many countries; the Hindoustani is spoken by the Moslems of India, and the Hindi by the Hindoo Brahmans. The Hindoustani is in India what the French is in Europe. The Chinese excepted, it is spoken by more people than any other language. But the Hindoui is of greater importance for the philologist, the archaeologist, the theologian and the philosopher. It is of this language that M. Garcin de Tassy has prepared a grammar, which may be regarded as an entirely new work. It is preceded by a very interesting introduction.

The following notice of the third No. of the Journal of the American Oriental Society, we copy from the Halle Allgem. Litt. Zeitung, Aug. 1847: "The American Oriental Society, after the death of its first president, John Pickering, well known among us as a linguist, has been or-

ganized anew, and has published the third No. of its Journal. Prof. Edward Robinson of New York is now president of the Society, and Prof. Edward E. Salisbury of New Haven, secretary. The new Number of the Journal contains, first, an interesting essay on Arabic Music by Eli Smith of Beirût, partly from a treatise of Mikhâïl Meshâkah, a native Arab, living at Damascus, and partly from an older Ms. on Music, which belongs to the rich collection of Mr. Salisbury. From the first is borrowed especially the theory of Intervals and an exhibition of the melodies now in use; from the other, which is more concerned with ancient music, the chapter on musical rhythm and the description of the ancient Arabic guitar, while from the first, in conclusion, is taken a description of modern musical instruments. This careful labor of Mr. Smith is at all events an important supplement to that which Kosegarten supplied in his edition of Kitâb el-Aghâny, on Arabic Music, taken chiefly from Fârâby. Then follow Notes on Arakan by Comstock, a deceased missionary, with a chart, together with some notes by Salisbury. Then succeed the first three chapters of Genesis, translated into the language of the Sooahelee by Dr. Krapf, with an introduction by Mr. Greenough. The essay will be very welcome in Germany, since at this moment the languages of the east coast of Africa are claiming the closer attention of several investigators. The first No. of the Journal of the German Oriental Society contains an essay on the subject by Ewald; and the next No. will bring out the labors of Gabelentz and Pott. The American Journal contains, besides, extracts from Burnouf's History of Buddhism, Lassen's Indian Antiquities, and notices of other recent works and occurrences in the field of oriental literature. All these notes are from the pen of Mr. Salisbury, and they testify alike of extensive learning and of solid, scientific judgment."

A work of great value for the history of Europe in the period of the Reformation has just been completed, viz. "Correspondence of the Emperor Charles V., from the royal archives and from the Bibliothèque de Bourgogne at Brussels, communicated by Dr. Karl Lanz." It is published at Leipsic in 3 vols., containing in all about 1400 closely printed pages.

The nine Austrian universities, Vienna, Prague, Padua, Pesth, Pavia, Lemberg, Gratz, Innspruck and Olmütz, contained, according to the last published accounts, 419 professors and assistants and 15,794 students. The State expenditure for these seminaries is about 670,000 gulden per annum. The sum of 33,072 gulden is given to 446 students as stipends. Besides these universities, there are in Austria, six institutions for the study of medicine, twelve for surgical and veterinary studies, twenty-six for juridical, 114 for theological, and 124 for philosophical.

The income of the six Prussian universities, Berlin, Bonn, Breslau, Greifswalde, Halle and Königsberg, of the academy at Münster and of

the lyceum at Braunsberg, for the year 1840, was 502,400 thaler; for 1847, 581,981 thaler. Of this latter sum, 81,239 thaler were the proper earnings of the institutions, 47,829 were from foundations and 452,913 from the national treasury. The expenditures in 1847, were for the academical administration 38,796 thaler, for professors and teachers 305,375, for libraries, collections, etc., 169,548, for premiums 1,965, for the support of students 23,274, for various offices, etc. 43,023.

Dr. Nitzsch, who has been lately transferred from Bonn to Berlin, lectures, during the present winter, on the History of Evangelical Missions and on Theological Ethics; Dr. Neander, on the genetic development of the hostile relations of Catholicism and Protestantism, and of Rationalism and Supranaturalism, on Christian Dogmatics, and on the Gospel and Epistles of John; Dr. Ritter, on the Peninsula of Sinai; Dr. Lepsius, on a geographico-historical Description of Egypt and Ethiopia, with a survey of their monuments.

Thiersch, a man of liberal views, has been appointed rector of the university of Munich. Dr. Herzog of Lausanne, author of the excellent life of Oecolampadius, has been appointed professor of theology in the University of Halle. Prof. Tellkampf of Columbia College, N. Y. has been appointed professor in the philosophical faculty of the university of Breslau. Caspari of Leipsic, author of an Arabic Grammar, has accepted a call as professor of theology in the university of Christiania.

The thirteenth volume of Gersdorf's Biblioth. Pat. Eccl. Lat. contains the works of Minucius Felix, under the care of Oehler. The thirteen volumes are sold for 9⅓ thaler. The Messianic Prophecies of the O. Test. with reference to the principal N. Test. citations, by Prof. Stähelin of Basil, in one vol. pp. 175, is published.

Rev. Mr. Willmott, author of the new Life of Jeremy Taylor, is preparing a biography of old Dr. Thomas Brown.—A new edition of Prof. Sedgwick's Studies of the University of Cambridge, has appeared.—Bähr's History of Roman Literature has been translated by Mr. Metcalfe.—Sir Francis Palgrave's "History of England in Church and State," will soon appear in two volumes.—Rev. T. Jarrett, Professor of Arabic at Cambridge, will soon publish a new Hebrew and Arabic Lexicon.—Neander's Julian the Apostate is translated by Mr. Cox.—Mr. Hallam is about to publish an additional volume of Notes to his work on the Middle Ages.

By recent letters from Syria we learn that a Society mainly composed of young Arab scholars, lately formed in Beirût, have purchased, in one collection, 500 Arabic Mss. They are nearly all Moslem, and many of them very old; some of them between 700 and 800 years. The character is extremely beautiful. The library belonged to a noble family, so reduced as to be

obliged to sell. It is particularly rich in Moslem theology, law, grammar, rhetoric and logic, with a fair proportion of mathematics, medicine, history and philosophical works. The Society in eight months have procured 700 volumes.

To the list in our last No. of Biblical, Theological and Classical works published in the United States, within the past two years, we add the following:

Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity delivered before the Lowell Institute, Boston, by Mark Hopkins, D. D. president of Williams College. Boston, T. R. Marvin, 8vo. pp. 383.

By the same author, Miscellaneous Essays and Discourses. Boston, T. R. Marvin, 1847, pp. 514, 8vo.

Sermons by the Rev. George W. Bethune, minister of the Third Reformed Dutch Church. Philadelphia, Mentz and Rovoudt, 1846, 8vo. pp. 301.

Lectures on Christian Character, by Joshua Bates, D. D., late president of Middlebury College. Andover, Allen, Morrill & Wardwell, 1846, 8vo. pp. 468.

The Middle Kingdom. By S. Wells Williams, Esq. With numerous Illustrations and a Map. Two thick volumes, 2 vols. post 8vo. pp. 589, 614. New York: Wiley and Putnam, 1847.

General History of the Christian Religion and Church; from the German of Dr. Augustus Neander. By Joseph Torrey, professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy in the University of Vermont. Boston, Crocker and Brewster, 1847, Vol. I. 8vo. pp. 740. 1848, Vol. II. pp. 768.

The following works are in preparation:

Horace, by Prof. J. L. Lincoln of Brown University.

Cicero De Senectute et De Amicitia, and his Select Orations, by Prof. Johnson of the New York University.

Cicero De Officiis, by Prof. Thacher of Yale College.

Sallust, by Noble Butler.

Caesar, by Rev. J. A. Spencer.

The Rev. John Codman, D. D., for many years one of the Visitors of the Theological Seminary, Andover, has bequeathed to it his valuable theological library, consisting of about 1250 volumes.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

AND

THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

NO. XVIII.

MAY, 1848.

ARTICLE I.

THE PELAGIAN CONTROVERSY.—A HISTORICAL ESSAY.

By Prof. Philip Schaff, Mercersburg, Pa.

Introduction.

The Pelagian controversy is concerned with the deepest interests of practical Christianity, the cardinal doctrines of sin and grace. The whole resolves itself at last into the question, whether redemption and sanctification are the work of man or the work of God. Before the time of Augustine, the doctrines of human freedom, of original sin and imputed guilt, and of the factors that enter into conversion, had not become the object of controversy in any proper sense. The church had other most weighty problems to solve; in particular she was called upon to maintain the divinity of Christ and the doctrine of the holy Trinity against all sorts of adversaries. These anthropological points accordingly remained still, as to doctrine, very indefinite. The Greek church in general leaned towards an anthropology, in which the freedom of man was made to take a very high place; while the Latin theologians, the African fathers, Tertullian and Cyprian in particular, laid more emphasis upon the corruption of the human nature, through the fall of Adam, and the necessity of divine grace. In the beginning of the fifth century, these different doctrinal conceptions were made to stand out, one over against the other in sharp and full contradiction. Pelagius became the immortal representative of a tendency, that has since continued to reveal itself under various forms

throughout the entire history of the Christian church, the fundamental anthropological heresy, which must always influence more or less all other parts of the Christian system.

Pelagianism, in its whole mode of thinking, starts from man, and seeks to work itself upwards gradually by means of an imaginary good will, to holiness and communion with God. Augustinism pursues the opposite way, deriving from God's unconditioned all-working grace, a new life and all power of doing good. The first is led from freedom over into a legal, self-righteous piety; the other rises from the slavery of sin to the glorious liberty of the children of God. For the first, revelation is of force, only as an outward help or the power of a high example; for the last, it is the inmost life, the very marrow and blood, of the new man. The first, consistently carried out, runs towards an Ebionitic view of Christ, and can see in him only a distinguished man, a virtuous sage, a prophet, but not properly a high-priest or king; the last here finds Him, in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily, and who is the principle of an entirely new spiritual creation. The first makes conversion a process of gradual moral purification on the ground of original nature; with the last, it is a total change, in which the old passes away and all becomes new. The first pleases itself with the dignity and energy of man; the last is lost wholly in the contemplation of the majesty and almighty grace of God. The first deals with the every-day understanding, reasons acutely and clearly, and is thus more popular; the other descends from the surface into the abyss of existence, brings forth the hidden treasures of knowledge from their mysterious depths, and is immeasurably more satisfactory in this way to *mature* thought. Pelagianism begins with self-exaltation and an undue estimate of its own powers, only to end at last in overwhelming self-delusion; Augustinism casts man first down into the dust of humiliation and self-despair, to raise him again on the wings of divine trust to the highest moral power; draws from him tears of penitential grief, in order that from his heart may stream forth afterwards the joyful praise of God's almighty grace.

Even if it should be supposed that Augustine, through the contradiction that stood in his way, and the inexorable consistency of his own dialectic mind, was carried into the opposite extreme, so as to venture on assertions which for the simple Christian consciousness are too harsh, and that seem to transcend the bounds of sober scriptural knowledge; there can be no doubt still, but that his position has the advantage decidedly of the other, in the way of greater depth, and richer experience, and fuller knowledge of the Scriptures, particularly the epistles of Paul.

We will, in the first place, bring into view briefly the personal *history* and *character* of the two men, who took the lead in the controversy, and are still known as the standing representatives of the opposite modes of thinking which entered into it; for the purpose of apprehending both systems genetically. In the second place, we will relate the *external history* of the controversy itself. Lastly, we shall represent, in three sections, its *inward form*, or the *points of difference* which it actually involved.

I. Pelagius and Augustine.—Their Life and Character.

Of the outward life of Pelagius we know but little; this little however is characteristic. He was a monk from Britain, born about the middle of the fourth century. His original name is said to have been Morgan, which signifies, of the sea, or by the sea, corresponding with the sense of Pelagius in Greek. He gave himself much to the study of the Greek church writers. It is probable that the old British church sprang from the Oriental, and stood connected with it in some way. From the beginning, he showed much earnestness of life, and an active concern for his own improvement and that of others in his own way. He was regarded as an eminent Christian. Augustine, sharply as he opposed his system, if we except the well-founded charge of dishonesty, nowhere assails his personal character, but professes even to regard him with esteem and love. This speaks well for the nobleness of his spirit.

But this morality has no deep character, and was not the fruit of an active and rich living faith. It was natural virtue, baptized with the water, but not with the fire of Christianity; such a virtue as we often meet with still in monasticism, consisting in legal ascetic exercises, victory over sensual appetites, the avoidance of all gross outbreaks of sin, discipline of the will and self-mastery, full of self-righteousness, and perhaps also, unconsciously, of spiritual pride. This morality rests mainly in externals. It proceeds not from a real change of the inmost mind, from the force of that humble love, which stripped of all self-reliance casts itself unreservedly upon the mercy of God. Pelagius had no fiery sensuality to contend with probably, as Augustine had; he was not called to pass through such mighty conflicts and decisive crises. His life was quietly developed in its own direction, he was happily successful in repressing all tendencies to gross sin, and in securing a certain capacity of moral self-government; but this precisely served to increase his high opinion of the power of the will, his confidence in himself. He had the monkish imagination,

that man is able, in the pursuit of perfection, (an object within his reach even in this world,) to go beyond what the law requires at his hands; since he voluntarily assumed the vows of poverty, obedience, and celibacy. As a bishop once quoted that great word of Augustine: "My God, grant unto me what thou requirest, and require of me what thou wilt,"[1] Pelagius became excited; he thought the freedom of the will endangered; he was not able to rise to the conception, that the fountain from which the moral law comes, is that from which must flow also the power that is needed for its fulfilment. In short, the morality of Pelagius was dissevered from faith, which was in his view for the most part only such a dead belief as is contended against by James. It is characteristic of all Pelagian tendencies, of Rationalism for instance, that they undervalue doctrine and faith, and place the substance of Christianity in its moral precepts. The sermon on the mount, accordingly, and the epistle of James, are in their view of far more weight than the discourses of the Lord as given by John or the epistle to the Romans. It commences with that, which properly can be only a consequence. Pelagianism stands in close consanguinity with Rationalism, although Pelagius did not carry out his system to this point. Rationalism is simply the form in which Pelagianism becomes at last theoretically complete. The high opinion which the Pelagian holds of the natural will, is transferred with equal right by the Rationalist to the natural reason; and as the first feels able to dispense with the assistance of grace in the work of moral improvement, so the last holds itself equally competent to advance in the knowledge of divine things without the light of revelation. The divinity of Pelagianism, so far as its practical tendency may require it to have any, is rationalistic; the morality of Rationalism is *out and out* Pelagian.

St. Augustine's life is wholly different from that of Pelagius. On first view, the latter seems to have the advantage of greater purity and more undisturbed harmony, whilst the former is known to have passed through great errors and sins, before he found his Saviour. But only he who can fall very low, is capable of rising also very high. Augustine, after his conversion, stands out as a wonderful monument of God's redeeming mercy for all ages. He is not only the leading genius of the church of his time, but unquestionably one of the deepest and most influential theologians, if not indeed the very greatest, since the days of the apostles. Only such men as Anselm, Luther, Calvin can at all stand in comparison with him, and in one point he is certainly far superior to the Reformers; in this, namely, that both

[1] Da, Deus, quod jubes, et jube quod vis.—Confess. X. 29.

the Catholic church and the Protestant are accustomed to bow before him with equal reverence. He is not only the principal founder of the Catholic system, as it stood in the Middle Ages, but at the same time through his deep speculations on sin and grace, in a certain sense the originator also of that movement which lies at the bottom of all modern history.

We cannot, of course, enter here into the particulars of his most interesting life. We have only to do with it so far as it seems to be necessary for a full and organic understanding of his views on sin and grace, as the theoretic reflection of his practical experience.

Augustine, born A. D. 354 at Tegaste in Numidia, was the son of a heathen father and of a Christian mother, the well known Monica, who accompanied his life as a protecting genius with prayers and tears, and must be counted amongst the brightest specimens of pious women. The grateful son has erected a monument to her in his celebrated "Confessions," which none can contemplate without edification and deep emotion.

In his childhood, under the care of such a mother, Augustine received deep religious impressions, too deep ever to be entirely eradicated. His heart, he says, sucked in the name of the Saviour with his mother's milk, so that nothing, which was quite without this name, however learned and attractive it might have been, could at any time take full possession of him. In his youth, however, particularly during his studies in the high school of Carthage, he was drawn aside from this path, and fell into sins of the flesh, which he himself afterwards confessed to God and to the world with unfeigned humility and repentance. Thousands of honored men have fallen much deeper, without the courage or sincerity to make a like confession. At the same time his mind was carried away by the errors of the Manichaeans, with whom he held communion for nine years, and ultimately sunk into the arms of skepticism, as taught in the philosophical school of the New Academy.

Still during his alienation from God, he had strong aspirations for something better. The most beautiful sentiment in the beginning of his "Confessions:" "Tu nos fecisti ad te, et cor nostrum inquietum est, donec requiescat in te," expresses his own experience. His heart, although the seat of unclean passions, was truly restless; it could not live without the most intense love, but felt all along, that it had not yet found the right object. His mind was continually and everywhere, except in the right place, seeking the truth, the solution of the mystery of man and his Maker. It wandered from one branch of learn-

ing to another, it entered deeply into the different systems of philosophy, to return more dissatisfied and thirsty than before.

In this unfortunate state he went to Europe; first to Rome, afterwards to Milan, called thither as a rhetorician, under very flattering prospects, highly recommended and respected for his extraordinary talents. There it was, that by the grace of God he found his Saviour again, never more to lose him. Different causes led to his ultimate conversion. The study of the Platonic and New-Platonic philosophy delivered him from the dualism of Manes and the emptiness of skepticism, while it filled his mind once more with confidence in truth and with a longing after the ideal world. As with many Greek fathers, it served as a bridge to faith. Two things, however, he missed in this lofty system, love, which builds on the ground of humility, and the name of Jesus, without which the world is a chaos. Of greater service to him was his acquaintance with Ambrose, the celebrated bishop of Milan, whose eloquent sermons he went to hear, first out of curiosity, but by and by from a sense of real want. He made him acquainted with the true doctrine of the church, the depositary of Christ's life and of all-saving truth. Thirdly his mother, who had followed him from Africa, was offering prayers and intercessions for her dear son day and night. Finally, the reading of the Bible, to which Ambrose pointed him as the infallible rule and fountain of the doctrines of the Catholic church, particularly the earnest and thorough study of the epistles of Paul, accompanied by prayer and meditation, decided the conflict.

Theoretically he was now sufficiently convinced of the truth of Christianity, although his views continued to be still for a time, as his earlier writings show, too much tinctured with Platonism: but practically he found his passions stronger than his knowledge, and had to fight as severe a battle, as hero ever fought, the battle between the will of the flesh and the will of the spirit, which Paul describes in the seventh chapter of his epistle to the Romans. It ended with the exclamation: "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit."

In his thirty-third year Augustine, after many wanderings, was baptized, together with his illegitimate son, by Ambrose, to the great joy of his mother and the church. He returned to Africa, spent three years in retirement, and was then against his wish elected presbyter first, and afterwards bishop of Hippo Regius, (now Bona), where he

labored for the cause of Christ till his death, A. D. 430. Without any hierarchical spirit, he became, by his gigantic mind and deep-rooted piety, the leader in all controversies of the time, the spiritual head of the African and of the whole church, and through his profound writings the source of inestimable light and comfort to all ages and climes since.

If we now view this short outline of his life in its relation to those doctrines, which are emphatically stamped with his name, we must admit, that he was peculiarly qualified, not only successfully to overthrow all those erroneous systems, through which his own mind had passed, particularly Manichaeism, the last and most dangerous form of the Gnostic heresy spread all over the primitive church, but also to set forth those deep views on man's fall and Christ's redemption, which characterize his opposition to Pelagianism. It is an abominable heresy to say: Let us continue in sin, that grace may abound. But it is nevertheless a fact, that God in his infinite wisdom employs the former sins and errors of his servants, to make them more humble in themselves and useful for their fellow men. Paul was better fitted to attack the legal righteousness of the Pharisees, because he had been himself a zealous defender of the law against the followers of the gospel. The more sincerely and deeply Luther had been attached to the Roman Catholic religion, the more powerful and successful became afterwards his opposition to it. Thus Augustine's licentious youth opened to his view the abyss of human corruption, while the remembrance of it afterwards taught him humility, the ground of all sound piety. In all his writings, he throws his life away, as it were, to find it again in Christ alone. The knowledge of sin is the indispensable condition of the knowledge of grace. This he had experienced, in spite of his unworthiness, beyond human expectation and calculation. No wonder, that he abounds in gratitude to his Saviour, and is inexhaustible in describing and praising his infinite mercy, and refuting those errors, which attack its majesty and power.

II. External History of the Controversy.

In the beginning of the fifth century, A. D. 409, we find Pelagius at Rome. There he composed his Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul, in which he disclosed indeed his particular tendency, but not in such a way as to create attention. The controversy broke out publicly, in the first place, through Celestius, one of his disciples.

The native country of this man cannot be determined certainly. He had been for some time an advocate at Rome; but through the in-

fluence probably of Pelagius, who became acquainted with him there, relinquished this situation for the monastic life. He was much better suited than his teacher, to become a public champion. He was still in the bloom of manhood, while Pelagius stood on the threshold of old age. His former employment, moreover, had trained him to be a dialectician and a polemic; whereas Pelagius was fond of peace, yielded easily his own convictions even, and altogether troubled himself but little in regard to the theory of his system.

In the year 411, the two like-minded friends betook themselves to Africa. They passed through Hippo, but did not find Augustine at home. He was just then in Carthage, on the business of the Donatists. Pelagius wrote him a very polite and respectful letter; to which Augustine returned a friendly answer, though not without adverting to the great importance of the true doctrine concerning sin. Pray for me, he said, "that God may make me to be in reality, what you take me for already." Pelagius travelled soon after to Palestine. Celestius remained in Carthage, and applied for the situation of a presbyter, strangely enough, in the very region, where, by reason of the vast influence of Augustine, he had most cause to expect opposition.

Celestius, by his talents and his ascetic zeal, gained himself many friends; but his opinions soon brought him into trouble. The deacon Paulinus of Milan, who happened to be in Carthage at this time, gave notice of him to the bishop Aurelius, and appeared subsequently as his accuser, in a council held here in the year 412. He was charged with seven errors, said to be found in his writings: 1. Adam was created mortal, and would have died even if he had not sinned. 2. Adam's sin injured himself only, and not the human race. 3. Children come into the world in the same state in which Adam was before his fall. 4. Neither does the whole human race die in consequence of Adam's fall, nor the whole human race rise again in consequence of Christ's resurrection. 5. Even unbaptized children are saved. 6. The law leads into the kingdom of heaven, in the same way with the gospel. 7. Even before the coming of Christ, there were men without sin. Of chief account were the second and third propositions, which were closely connected, and became afterwards the main subject of controversy.

Celestius gave evasive answers. These, he said, were questions of school speculation, that did not touch the substance of faith, and in regard to which different opinions were found in the church. As, however, he would not consent to retract the declarations laid to his charge, the synod shut him out from the church communion. He

betook himself immediately to Ephesus, where he became presbyter.

Augustine had no part personally in these transactions. As, however, the Pelagian doctrine found still many adherents even in Africa, he wrote as early as A. D. 412—415, several pieces against it, though as yet with respect and forbearance.

In the meantime, the controversy broke out also in Palestine, where Pelagius now resided. He found there much more favor; for the oriental church was not yet affected by the Augustinian mode of thinking, and held fast both the conceptions of freedom and grace, without entering into any very close account of their mutual relation. Nor did the opposition to Pelagius spring at all from the oriental church itself. But there happened to be at this time two Western theologians in Palestine. In the first place, Jerome of Bethlehem, a man of great learning indeed, but passionate, quarrelsome and inconstant. He had been an enthusiastic admirer of Origen, but joined himself afterwards, in the *Origenistic* controversies, to his bitter and intolerant opposers. It struck him now that he could derive the views of Pelagius concerning freewill, and the goodness of man's nature, from the influence of Origen. He felt himself personally affronted by Pelagius besides, as the latter had assailed some of his writings. He wrote against him accordingly, though at first without giving his name. With Jerome lived also at this time, engaged in completing his studies, a young Spanish ecclesiastic named Paulus Orosius, a most devoted follower of Augustine.

In an assembly of his clergy held by bishop John of Jerusalem, A. D. 415, this Orosius appeared against Pelagius, making it known that a council at Carthage had condemned Celestius, and that Augustine had written against his errors. Pelagius answered evasively and contemptuously: "What care I for Augustine!" Orosius was of the opinion, that one who could show such disrespect towards *the* bishop, to whom the whole North African church stood indebted for its restoration—referring probably to his settlement of the Donatist controversies—deserved to be excluded from the communion of the entire Christian church. But John took the accused into his protection. Though he was only a monk and a layman, he made him take a seat among his presbyters, and appeared openly as his friend. Even the assertion of Pelagius, that man may easily obey the commandments of God so as to become free from sin, he was content to let pass, on his allowing, in the most general terms, that the help of God was needed for the purpose. After much talk, backwards and forwards, it was resolved that the matter should be laid before the Roman bishop

Innocent, since indeed both the contending parties belonged to the Western church. In the meantime, they must forbear all further attacks on one another.

A synod held that same year, in December, at Diospolis in Palestine, under the presidency of Eulogius, bishop of Caesarea, turned out more favorably still for Pelagianism. The points of accusation were unskilfully presented. Pelagius was able to help himself by ambiguous expressions, and went so far as to condemn doctrines of Celestius, which were also his own, not indeed as heresy, but remarkably enough, as nonsense and folly. The synod did not go far into the subject, and without understanding it fully declared the accused free from heresy. Jerome was right, when he styled it *synodus miserabilis;* but Augustine spoke truly also, when he said: "It was not the heresy which was there acquitted, but only the man who denied the heresy."

The matter took a new turn, when it came before the Roman see. Two synods, one at Carthage and another at Mileve, (now Mela,) in the year 416, condemned anew the Pelagian error, and made a report of their action to pope Innocent. A third more confidential letter was addressed to him by a number of the African bishops, among whom was Augustine. Pelagius also forwarded to him a letter, with a confession of his faith, which however were received later. Innocent understood the controversy, and also his own advantage by its means. He commended the Africans for laying their cause before the church of St. Peter, to which all the affairs of Christendom of right should be referred, and declared at the same time his full approbation of the sentence they had passed against Pelagius, Celestius, and all their adherents.

Not long after this, however, A. D. 417, Innocent died, and was succeeded by Zosimus, probably of oriental origin. Celestius appeared personally at Rome, and was enabled, by his written and oral explanations, to satisfy Zosimus. He was diffuse, like Pelagius, in setting forth his orthodoxy on other points, represented the points which were really at issue to be mere scholastic questions of little or no weight, and stood ready, if he had erred, to be corrected by the judgment of the Roman bishop. Zosimus, who, as it would seem, had no theological judgment of his own in the case whatever, addressed now a strange letter to the African bishops, in which he blames them for not having considered the subject properly, and for pretending, in such questions of vain curiosity, to be wiser than the sacred Scriptures. He gave his decided testimony, at the same time, to the orthodoxy of Pelagius and Celestius. The letter of the first, it was

said, had filled the hearers, when read, with great joy, moving some even to tears, in sympathy with his unmerited wrongs. There was no passage in it, that did not make mention of God's grace and aid. Finally, he begged the bishops to submit themselves to the authority of the Roman see.

The Africans, however, were too sure of their cause to yield to so weak a decision, which stood besides in palpable contradiction to that of Innocent. On the contrary, at a synod held at Carthage, A. D. 117, they entered a respectful but decided protest against the judgment of Zosimus, and gave him to understand that he had allowed himself to be imposed upon by the indefinite expressions of Celestius. At a general synod held in the same city, the following year, the bishops, upwards of 200 in number, set forth their opposition to the Pelagian error, in nine canons, answerable in full to the Augustinian view. They succeeded also in obtaining a rescript against the Pelagians, from the emperor Honorius. All this had its effect on Zosimus. About the middle of the year 418 accordingly, he addressed a circular letter, (*epistola tractoria,*) to all the bishops of the East and West, in which he pronounced an anathema against Pelagius and Celestius, who in the meantime had withdrawn from Rome, and declared his agreement with the decrees of the council of Carthage, on the doctrines of the corruption of human nature, baptism and grace. This the Italian bishops were compelled to subscribe, and eighteen, for refusing to do so, were deprived of their places. Several of these subsequently changed their mind, and were again restored; but the most distinguished among them, Julian of Eclanum in Apulia, continued firm till his death, and in his banishment defended his principles, with the greatest determination, particularly against Augustine, to whom he attributed all the misfortune of his party. Bishop Julian stands before us the most acute and systematic among the Pelagians, and the most formidable of Augustine's adversaries; a man, who for his talents, his moral deportment, and his unflinching fidelity to his own convictions, is worthy of all respect; but who at the same time, it must be confessed, cannot be vindicated from the charge of violent passionateness and haughty presumption. We find him, A. D. 429, in Constantinople; by order of the emperor, however, he was required to leave the city. He is said to have died, A. D. 450.

Of the subsequent life and death of Pelagius and Celestius, we have no information, farther than that the latter was about the year 429 driven out of Constantinople.

Thus was Pelagianism, as early as about the year 420, externally crushed; although it continued still to have its scattered adherents in

Italy till near the middle of the century, so that the Roman bishop, Leo the Great, found it necessary to charge the bishops strongly, that they should not receive any Pelagian into the communion of the church, without express recantation. At the synod of Ephesus, in 431, Pelagius was placed in the same class with Nestorius; and it must be owned, that they are not without a certain kind of affinity.

In looking back now upon the whole controversy, we find it to be more than the offspring of mere passion and violence. It contrasts favorably with the oriental controversies, in this respect, that no unworthy intrigues prevail in it; the ardent and pure zeal of a great man for the most important truths of the gospel occupies the foreground, and wins the victory at last for its own good cause.

The external discomfiture of Pelagianism, however, would have been of small account, if it had not been inwardly overcome, at the same time, by the weapons of the spirit, and the force of true science enlisted in the service of faith. This was accomplished through Augustine, who has thus secured to himself the highest merit, as regards theology and the church. To the consideration of this we now come.

III. Inward History of the Controversy.

The sources for understanding the doctrine of Pelagius are his own writings, which have been accidentally preserved among the works of his adversary, Jerome. 1. His *Commentary on Paul's Epistles*, of the year 410; it has been somewhat changed indeed by Cassiodorus, but still betrays its author on every page. 2. An ascetic letter to the nun Demetrias, (*Epistola ad Demetriadem,*) on virginity. 3. His confession of faith, (*Libellus fidei,*) addressed, in 417, to the Roman bishop Innocent I. 4. To these must be added various extracts from other lost works, preserved in the counter-writings of St. Augustine. Of the writings of Celestius and Julian, nothing more has come down to us than some fragments in the same way. Augustine himself wrote a great many tracts against Pelagius and his adherents, between the years 412 and 428. The most important are, "*Of the Spirit and the Letter,*" 412, "*On nature and grace,*" 415, "*Of the grace of Jesus Christ,*" 418, "*On Original Sin,*" 418, and in particular six books "*Against Julian,*" 421.

The points of controversy were not handled indeed in systematic order, as in general seldom happens in such discussions. Still there is clearly at hand on both sides a system in fact, involving a close internal connection of the doctrines brought under debate, which our exposition here requires us to bring into view. The controversy em-

braces the three articles of man's *primitive state*, *fall* and *redemption;* his entire relation to God therefore in the three stages of his historical development, which are also repeated in the life of every individual. We have to consider accordingly, 1. The doctrine of freedom and the state of innocence. 2. The doctrine of the fall of Adam, and of sin, in particular, original sin and imputed guilt. 3. The doctrine of grace and redemption. We might add also the *doctrine of predestination*, which Augustine regarded as a necessary consequence in the end of his doctrine of sin and grace. But this point we shall pass over, as it is not, after all, essentially involved in the opposition to Pelagianism, and would require us, if thoroughly discussed, to go beyond the bounds of our present subject. We will present first the views of Pelagius, and then in opposition to them those of Augustine, interspersing suitable critical observations to make the whole more clear.

§ 1. *The Doctrine of Freedom and the Primitive State.*

Pelagius held the original state of man to have been substantially the same with his condition at the present time, so that what was true of Adam before the fall is to be regarded as still of force in the case also of his posterity. Here we have at once a grand fundamental error of the system. Adam, he taught, was created by God with reason and freedom. Freedom is the highest good of man, his honor and glory. It consists in the ability of doing good or evil, equally complete on both sides. It is always free to us, says Pelagius, to do either one or the other, since both are always in our power; we possess the power of free choice, equally enabling us to sin or not to sin. In virtue of this ability, man may produce either the flowers of virtue or the thorns of vice. Such was the freedom of the primitive state, and such also is our freedom still. "We say, that man has power always either to sin or not to sin, that we may allow to him always the possession of a free will." So much with regard to the spiritual constitution of the first man. In reference to his physical condition, Pelagius taught that death is a natural necessity, and that Adam therefore would have died without sin. Where the Scriptures seem to declare the contrary, he understood them to speak of moral corruption or eternal damnation.

We see from this, that Pelagius conceived of freedom only as the power of choice, *liberum arbitrium*, and never went beyond this its lowest stage. But this indeterminate middle point between good and evil is one that must necessarily be transcended. By the act of

choice, the man goes beyond it, and determines himself in favor of one or the other; and every new act serves to confirm him in the direction taken. The formal power of choice ceases to be simply formal; acquires real force, and so overthrows itself more and more, in proportion to the moral development of the subject. The sinner becomes the slave of evil, the good man a child of God, who in the end is no longer able to choose and do evil, because he *cannot* have any such *will*. True freedom, therefore, as recognized in the holy Scriptures, is self-determination to good, and to good only, and so of course becomes identical in the end with moral necessity. Such power of choice as leaves the man just as much inclined to evil as to good, is in itself an imperfection, that shows already a removal from the original goodness of the creature. Man may possess this indeed, in his present state, in things of inferior account; but where precisely it comes to a life question, the radical change is his nature itself, he shows himself bound by reason of sin. His present state is one of slavery; not Hercules at the forks of the road, but Hercules on the highway of evil. Pelagius knows only the two contraries, free choice and constraint; and his freedom of choice is without past or future, externally and internally dependent on nothing, a continual *tabula rasa*, that may take meaning at its own pleasure every moment, but only to fall back again after each single act to the indeterminate and undeterminable character it had before. Whilst Pelagius thinks to elevate man in this way, he binds him fast in fact to the starting place of his proper life. Nay more, he makes the essence of morality, a good disposition, to be impossible. Virtue and vice, according to his abstract conception of freedom, can consist only in single good or bad actions, that have no inward connection, and affect not the power of choice on which they depend. An atomistic morality, however, is no morality whatever.

The other point, namely, the view taken of death, which Pelagius sundered from all connection with sin, shows also the superficial character of his thinking. One that understands not the bitter fountain, cannot make right account of the stream that flows from it. The view leads besides to an unworthy conception of God, since it makes him to be the author directly of death, with its gloomy train of pains and sicknesses and evils of every kind.

AUGUSTINE has a much higher conception of Paradise, involving of course the possibility of a far deeper fall. The original state of the human race is viewed as of the same nature with the state of the blessed after judgment; only with this difference, that the first is to be compared to the germ, the second to the full grown fruit. According to Augus-

tine, man came absolutely faultless from the hand of his Maker, the true masterpiece of creation. He possessed freedom to good, reason for the knowledge of God, and also God's grace—by which is meant here, not exactly in its proper sense indeed, the divine assistance, without which no creature can continue in good. His relation to God was that of joyful and complete obedience. So also the relation of the body to the soul. There was as yet no lusting of the flesh against the spirit. "Tried and assaulted by no intestine war, Adam enjoyed in that happy place full peace with himself." With this inward state corresponded also the outward. It was not only a spiritual, but also a visible paradise for the senses, without sickness, pain, or want of any sort.

Still this state was only relatively perfect; in its kind, namely, as a child may be perfect in the character of a child, but yet is formed to become a man, or as the seed answers fully in itself to its own idea, but must become a tree. Only God is unchangeable and absolute in his being; man is subject to development in time, and by this of course to alteration also and change. The gifts which have been mentioned were bestowed upon him simply as powers, which included in themselves the possibility of a twofold development. Adam might proceed in a straight line, his nature unfolding itself harmoniously in undisturbed union with God, so as to attain gradually to a state of perfection; but it was possible for him also to fall away, and to come thus into a process of a different kind, in which his life should be developed only through the deep contradictions of sin. The mind included in itself the possibility of becoming incapable of error, the will the possibility of becoming incapable of sin, and the body the possibility of becoming incapable of death; and all this must have actually followed, in the case of *regular* evolution or growth. But this possibility was still only possibility, which for this very reason carried in itself the possibility also of the contrary.

Let us observe more closely the possibility of sin. Augustine distinguishes between "posse *non peccare*" and "*non posse* peccare." The first is *hypothetical freedom* from sin, which may however strike over into its opposite, the slavery of sin. This potential freedom belonged to Adam before the fall. The second is the absolute incapability of sin, which pertains to God, the good angels, and the saints made perfect. This, according to Augustine, is the *true freedom*, the glorious liberty of the children of God. "If the Son make you free, ye shall be free indeed." Freedom thus—and this is an essential point of difference between him and Pelagius, containing at the same time a most profound truth—is not a state of indecision between good and evil, but of decision in favor of good, and identical with moral neces-

sity. It is that state of the will, in which it *can* no longer do evil, because it *will* not, the *beata necessitas boni*, the direct opposite of the state of man before regeneration, or of the slavery of sin.[1] Freedom and grace are for Augustine corresponding conceptions. The more grace, the more freedom; and so also the reverse. The will is free in proportion as it is sound; and it is sound, in proportion as it moves in its true life element, in God, and obeys him from its own inmost impulse. *Deo servire, vera libertas est.* This great word deserves to be well considered by those, who confound the precious name of liberty with its satanic caricature, unbridled licentiousness, and in their blindness call themselves free, while they are the wretched slaves in fact of their own lawless self-will.

The case is similar also as regards the impossibility of death, on the part of the body. Augustine distinguished here again between "posse *non mori*," and "*non posse* mori." The last, denominated likewise *immortalitas major*, is the attribute of God, and of the saints after the resurrection, and so of course the negative expression only for eternal life. The first, *immortalitas minor*, is the capacity of immortality, which however is capable also of being corrupted, and so changed into mortality. This was the state before the fall. Adam had it in his power, by continuing obedient to God, the true centre of his being, to choose the *non posse peccare* and *non posse mori;* but he had power also not to will such choice. This power of not willing came not directly from God; for the same fountain cannot send forth at once sweet water and bitter; but it lay involved in the power of willing, as a possibility that should have been *negated* by the free volition of man. The possibility, however, was not thus neglected, but became actual, and this was the fall, the introduction of evil. We stand here before an abyss, a transcendent fact we may call it, which no thinking can fully fathom. It belongs however to the proper conception of evil, that it is unfathomable, contradiction itself indeed, the very negation of all reason and all sense.

Such is a connected representation of the statements of Augustine,

[1] Comp. also *De Civit. Dei*, l. XIV. 11, where there is no reference to Pelagius: Arbitrium igitur voluntatis tunc est vere liberum, cum vitiis peccatisque non servit. Tale datum est a Deo; quod amissum proprio vitio, nisi a quo dari potuit, reddi non potest. Unde Veritas dicit: *Si vos Filius liberavit, tunc vere liberi eritis.* Idque ipsum est autem, ac si diceret: Si vos Filius salvos fecerit, tunc vere salvi eritis. Inde quippe liberator, unde salvator. Augustine's doctrine on this most difficult subject is far from being satisfactory at all points and admits of great improvements; but it contains the germs of a reasonable as well as scriptural theory on liberty. The *historical* character of our Essay, however, forbids us to enter more fully into this question, which we cheerfully leave to more competent hands.

in different places, on the subject of the primitive state. It agrees essentially both with the idea of a holy God, who can create only what is good, and with the idea also of man, as a creature, made in the image of God, but capable of change. It must be acknowledged, however, that our excellent church father is often too much inclined to an *empirical* delineation of the paradisiacal blessedness, which goes beyond the simple statements of the Bible, and fails to make a proper distinction at times between the original state, which we are to think of as the innocence of childhood, and the state of moral maturity or manhood, bringing thus the beginning and the end too near together.

Setting aside, however, some rather too brilliant pencil strokes of speculative fancy, the view of Augustine is certainly the only one here that can be regarded as sound and true. For we have in it a real, living beginning, in which the whole present and future is comprehended, the possibility of a perfectly sinless harmonious development, and the possibility at the same time of the fall and redemption, and which is already a prophetic mirror also of the blessedness beyond the grave. Pelagius recognizes no true beginning, and so accordingly also no progress, no fall, no redemption, as will appear from what is to follow.

§ 2. *The Doctrine of the Fall and its Consequences.*

Pelagius admitted indeed that Adam had sinned. It belonged of course to the very nature of free choice, that he might choose evil. But this fall of the first man was, in his view, a single isolated fact, just like the actual sins committed by other men, and in truth a very small offence. Julian compares it to the inconsiderate fault of a child, that allows itself to be blinded by some tempting object of sense, but is sorry afterwards for its disobedience. Hence also it had no further consequences. The power of free choice was not lost by it at all. It might turn again, the next moment, towards good. And just as little did it affect the understanding or the condition of the body.

According to this then there is *no original sin;* but every child is still born into the world in the same state, in which Adam came from the hand of his Maker. Man is born without virtue as also without sin, but with the capacity for both.[1] Only this much Pelagius would

[1] *Pelagius in August. De Pecc. Orig.* 14: Omne bonum ac malum, quo vel laudabiles vel vituperabiles sumus, non nobiscum oritur, sed agitur a nobis; capaces enim utriusque rei, non pleni, nascimur, et ut sine virtute, ita et sine vitio procreamur; atque ante actionem propriae voluntatis, id solum in homine est, quod Deus condidit.

allow, that Adam, by transgressing the divine command, had set a bad example, which exerts a more or less pernicious influence upon his posterity. Celestius says, sin is not born with man, it is not a product of nature, but of the will.[1] The question he holds to be, whether sin is a matter of necessity or of free will. In the first case, it would not be sin; in the second it may be avoided, since the will is simply *liberum arbitrium*, the power of choice. With the denial of original sin, is rejected also of course the idea of imputed guilt. Such imputation of a foreign sin appeared besides to Pelagius, irreconcilable also with the justice of God.

On the nature of sin, Pelagius expresses himself no further than this, that he places it in the influence exerted upon the will by the *senses*. He has no conception properly of sinfulness, but only of single sins.

Here again, we have the same superficial, atomistic style of thinking, as before. In the first place Pelagius has no idea whatever of a general human life, an *organism*. Adam is for him an individual simply, like other men, and nothing more. His fall accordingly was that of an individual only, not that of the human race, as comprehended at the time in his person. Men are connected with one another only in an outward way, independent of one another, a mere living sand-heap. What is done by one therefore has no necessary influence upon another, every one commences the history of the human race as it were again from the start. This is perfectly atomistic, and utterly overthrows the idea of all history, and of everything like progressive development. Those passages of Paul in which he contrasts Adam and Christ as the two great representatives and progenitors of the human race, have for Pelagius no meaning. Where however no first Adam is admitted in the sense of Paul, as the bearer of the whole human race in its natural constitution, and so of course no original sin and imputed guilt, there also no second Adam can find room, no Redeemer of the human race, no imputation of the merit and righteousness of Christ. Pelagius has no power to conceive of the general as united with the individual and single. Christ also, then, for the system to be consistent, must have been a mere individual, whose life, death and resurrection, have no universal significance, reach not into the depths of the organic general life, but possess at best the force on-

[1] *Symbol. Fragm.* 1: In remissionem autem peccatorum baptizandos infantes non idcirco diximus, ut *peccatum ex traduce*, (that is, peccatum naturale,) firmare videamur, quod longe a catholico sensu alienum est. Quia peccatum non cum homine nascitur, quod postmodum exercetur ab homine; quia non naturae delictum, sed voluntatis esse, demonstratur.

ly of a moral pattern or *good example.* Pelagius has no knowledge of a productive principle of development, but of a dull unprogressive routine merely of every day events.

Still further, Pelagius knows sin only as isolated, atomistic acts of the will. But now every act is referable to an inward state, from which it springs, and works back again on the same. Sinful actions suppose an inclination of the mind to sin, a certain sinful propensity therefore already at hand, and contribute to form an evil character; as virtuous actions, on the other hand, point to a good fountain, and tend to make the character also increasingly good. Of such a sinful *habitus*, however, Pelagius has no knowledge; whence also original sin must appear to him as nonsense; for this is in fact simply the disposition of the will to evil, induced by the fall, as propagated by natural generation in virtue of the essential unity of the human race.

It is something false, finally, to place the essence of sin in sensuality, or the undue power of sense. This is only *one* form of sin, of secondary character besides, as having respect mainly to the body. The deepest nature of sin is spiritual, in the form of self-love, *egoism*, falling away from God, affecting to be like God.

We come now to the doctrine of Augustine. The primitive state of man included in itself the possibility of sin, and this formed the imperfection of that state. This possibility passed into fact; how or why, is necessarily incomprehensible, since evil never has a sufficient ground, like good; it is *unreason* itself. Adam fell not without temptation from without. That angel, who in his pride had turned away from God and towards himself, tempted man, whose upright state was itself the object of his envy. He addressed himself first to the woman, as the weaker and more credulous party. The sin of Adam consisted not essentially in partaking of the fruit, for this in itself was neither evil nor hurtful, but in *disobedience* to the commandment of God. "Obedience was enjoined in that command, as the virtue which is for the rational creature the *mother*, as it were, and *guardian* of all virtues." The principle or root of sin, on the contrary, was *pride, self-seeking*, the desire of the will to forsake its source, and to become a source for itself. This pride went before the outward act. "Our first parents became first secretly bad, so as then to fall into open disobedience. For it could never have come to an evil work, if an evil will had not gone before. This pride preceded even the temptation of the serpent. If man had not begun previously to please himself, the devil could have had no power over man."

The fall of Adam appears the more aggravated and worthy of punishment, when we consider, first, the height on which man previously

stood, the divine image in which he had been created; and then the simple and easy character of the command he was required to fulfil, in the midst of the abounding plenty of paradise; and lastly, the terrible penalty with which he was threatened on the part of his Creator and greatest Benefactor.

Augustine, we see, passes from the appearance to the substance, from the surface into the deep. He stops not with the outward act, but fastens his eye first of all on the inward mind that lies at the ground of all actions.

We pass now, however, to the *consequences* of the first sin. The more aggravated this sin seems to Augustine, the more momentous and terrible must be the results which flow from it, not only for Adam himself, but for all his posterity. The consequences are all alike penal inflictions of a righteous God, who has associated reward with goodness, but by the same law punishment also with sin. They are comprehended generally in the word *death*, taken in its widest sense, as Paul says, The wages of sin is death. So the death threatened, Gen. 2: 17, must be understood to include all evils, both of body and soul. Severally, Augustine reckons the consequences of sin under the following points, of which the first four are negative in their character and the others positive:

1. The loss of freedom, which stood originally in a positive inclination and love towards good, including also indeed the possibility of evil. In the room of this has entered the hard necessity of sinning, the slavery of evil. "The will, which with supporting grace would have become a fountain of good, was turned, by forsaking God, into a fountain of sin."

2. Darkness in the understanding. Man had the ability readily and easily to learn and rightly to comprehend truth. Now, however, knowledge is not clear, and can be obtained and communicated only with severe toil.

3. The loss of God's grace, which qualified man to do the good that freedom willed. By not willing it, he threw away also this ability, so that if he should even now will what is good, he has lost the power to do it.

4. The loss of paradise. By reason of the connection that holds between man and the rest of the creation, the influence of the fall is felt also on this, bringing wild disorder and mysterious terror into the life of nature. The paradisiacal peace has vanished from the earth. It brings forth thorns and thistles according to the divine curse, and in the sweat of his brow man is doomed to earn his bread.

5. Concupiscence, or the lusting of the flesh against the spirit.

Thus God punishes sin with sin—a proposition which Julian held to be blasphemous. Originally the body was as cheerfully subject to the spirit, as man himself was to God. There was but one will. But by the fall, this beautiful harmony is destroyed, and in place of it has come in that dualism and contradiction, which Paul describes particularly in the seventh chapter of his epistle to the Romans. The insurrection of the spirit against God, is followed by its natural punishment in the insurrection of the body against the spirit. This concupiscence, therefore, is what Paul denominates σάρξ in the bad sense. It is not the sensual part of man as such, but its predominance over his higher nature.[1] Though, indeed, Augustine was rather inclined, in his zeal for a free spiritual life, to bring even the lawful appetites of the body, hunger and thirst for instance, as taking the form of violent desire, into some remote connection at least with the fall.[2] Julian derived the strength of sensual desires from the original animal nature of man. Augustine answered him, that the superiority of man over the animal consists precisely in the full supremacy of reason over sense, so that his sinking in this view to a level with the animal must be regarded as a divine punishment. Concupiscence then, is not any more than the σάρξ of Paul, something merely corporeal, but has its seat full as much in the soul, without which no lust can be felt. We have already seen indeed, that Augustine places the essence of sin in self-seeking or *egoism*. We must assume then a contradiction in the soul itself, a lower, earthly, self-seeking impulse on one side, and a higher tendency related to God on the other.

This is the general sense of *concupiscentia;* the struggle of the lusts collectively both of body and soul, against the divine authority of the spirit. Frequently, however, Augustine uses the word, according to the sense of related terms, in the narrow signification also of unlawful sexual desire. This came in with the fall. The proof of it he finds in the shame of our first parents; which could not refer simply to their nakedness as such, as this was nothing new to them, but must be viewed as a sort of recoil from the sense of fleshly lust; something good, therefore, in and of itself, the conscience so to speak of the body, but called forth by unlawful desire, and a disturbance of the proper harmony between body and soul. Would there have been then no propagation, without the fall? There would have been cer-

[1] Not *sentiendi vivacitas*, but the libido sentiendi quae nos ad sentiendum sive consentientes mente sive repugnantes appetitu carnalis voluptatis impellit.—*C. Julian.* l. IV. § 66.

[2] Quis autem mente sobrius non mallet, si fieri posset, sine ulla mordaci voluptate carnali, vel arida sumere alimenta, vel humida, sicut sumimus haec aëria?

tainly. But in such a form, that reason should have had complete rule over sensual desire. Propagation would have been the product of pure will and sacred pious love, in which shame would have had just as little place, as in committing seed to the motherly bosom of the earth. But now desire tyrannizes over the spirit, as Augustine had learned by bitter experience in his earlier years. From this sinful element in the act of pro-creation, he derives the pains and sorrows of parturition, as indeed they are represented in Genesis to be the consequence of the fall and a part of the divine curse. Had man continued pure, the race would have been propagated, according to Augustine, without any labor or pain on the part of the woman.

6. Physical death, with its train of diseases and bodily pains. Adam was created indeed mortal, that is, with the possibility of dying, but not liable to death. By regular natural development, the possibility of death would have been at last changed into an impossibility, and the body gradually spiritualized and clothed with glory, without passing through any violent process or experiencing even the infirmities of old age. Instead of this, man is now subjected to the bitter necessity of dying. As the spirit chose of its own accord to forsake God, so must it now forsake the body also. It is well remarked, however, by Augustine, with deep meaning, that not merely the act which sunders soul and body, but the whole life of man as a sinner is throughout a process of dying. Death begins already with the pain that accompanies birth and the first cry of the infant. Thus the threatening of the Lord: "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," at once went into effect; for although our first parents still lived many years, they began notwithstanding even then to grow old and die. "Life consists now in an uninterrupted movement towards death, and no one is allowed to stop even for a moment, or to relax his gait, but all are forced to move as with one step, each urged onward exactly like the rest. For he whose life has been shorter, has lived for this reason no shorter day, than he whose life was longer; and those who require more time for death, travel not on this account more slowly, but perform only a longer journey."

7. These consequences of Adam's sin now extend, not merely to Adam himself, but to all his posterity. This brings us to the conception of *original sin* and *transmitted guilt*, which require to be handled somewhat more fully.

We have considered Adam's sin thus far as the act simply of an individual. It has, however, according to Augustine, still another aspect, which is of vast account for his system, and forms a main difference between him and Pelagius; namely, Adam possessed a *generic* character.

He is the progenitor of the whole race, not merely *a* man, but *the* man, in whom already all other men were organically and potentially at hand, as the tree in the seed. For this reason, the fall of Adam is the fall of the *entire race*. In him sinned the human *nature* as such, and so of course all who have part in it;[1] with the exception of Christ, who was not conceived with sinful lust. The corruption of the root reaches forth into the branches; through the *genus* are initiated at once all the individuals it includes. The same holds as regards guilt. All men come into the world as sinners deserving of punishment, and, under sentence of death, inherit from their progenitors the consequences of the fall. They are *massa perditionis*. This is the *peccatum originale*, the *vitium haereditarium*, the inborn sinful propensity of nature, the disposition to evil, from which of necessity all actual sins must proceed.

This original sin and guilt, Augustine teaches still further, propagates itself in natural generation. The generality, first lodged in Adam, unfolds itself into a succession of individual existences, that grow forth from one another organically. As, however, sin is not something physical, but primarily and essentially spiritual in its nature, the question rises, what theory concerning the origin and propagation of *souls* is adopted in Augustine's system. He brings forward, as is known, three such theories. 1. *Traducianism*, (from *traducere*, to draw out,) taught, that souls are produced by the act of generation, and so of course through human agency, the agency besides of the body. This theory was decidedly favorable to the doctrine of original sin, and had been adopted accordingly by many Western theologians, from the time of Tertullian, in support and explanation of it. 2. *Creationism*, (from *creare*,) takes the ground, that souls are created at birth immediately by God, and so joined with the body. This view was held by Jerome, who appealed in favor of it to the uninterrupted working attributed to God, John 5: 17. In this case, to hold fast the doctrine of original sin, it must be assumed that the soul, which can proceed from the hand of God only in a pure form, becomes sinful by its connection with the body, that springs from natural generation. 3. *Pre-existentianism*, which was derived from Plato and adopted by Origen, affirms that souls have already existed, before coming into their present state, in another world, and either de-

[1] *De peccatorum mentis et remissione*, l. III. c. 7. In Adam omnes tunc peccaverunt, quando in ejus natura illa insita vi, qua eos gignere poterat, adhuc omnes ille unus fuerunt. *De corrupt. et gratia* 10: Quia vero (Adam) per liberum arbitrium Deum deseruit, justum judicium Dei expertus est, ut cum tota sua stirpe, quae in illo adhuc posita tota cum illo peccaverat, damnaretur.

scend of their own accord now into bodies at birth, or are sent into them by God.

Augustine rejects decidedly only the last view, in the form in which it was held by Origen, as making the soul to be imprisoned in the body, for the expiation of sins committed in its pre-existent state and in some other world. On the other hand, he wavers between the first two views, as the Scriptures leave the subject indeed uncertain. He wishes to hold fast the idea of constant creation on the part of God, but to hold fast also, at the same time, the organic connection of soul and body. He looks upon the whole question as belonging to science and the school, rather than to faith and the church, and makes a confession of ignorance, which for a man of his speculative genius, involves no small self-denial. "Where the Scriptures," he says, "give no sure testimony, the human mind must refrain from deciding one way or the other. Had it been necessary for man's salvation to know more on the subject, the Scriptures no doubt would have said more."

We must now pass over to the arguments, on which mainly Augustine grounded his doctrine of original sin and guilt as now explained. We notice first those of a *positive* character.

1. Among scriptural passages, he presses especially the words, Rom. 5: 12, ἐφ᾽ ᾧ *πάντες ἥμαρτον*, which the Vulgate translate erroneously, *in quo* omnes peccaverunt. As Augustine understood but little Greek, he confined himself commonly to the Latin Bible, and referred the *in quo* to Adam, (the *ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου* in the beginning of the verse,) whereas it must either be referred to the proximate word *θάνατος*, or more correctly be taken as a neuter. But it would be now the height of folly, to reject, on account of this exegetical blunder, the whole Augustinian theory. The doctrine of original sin may be deduced from a multitude of other passages, (for example, Ps. 51: 7. Gen. 3: 21. John 3: 6. 1 Cor. 7: 14. Eph. 2: 3,) and the parallel which Paul draws, Rom. 5: 12 ff. compared with 1 Cor. 15: 45 ff., between Adam and Christ as the two great progenitors of the human race, whose image we bear, gives exactly such a view of the organic relation of the first man to his posterity, as necessarily leads to the same result. The name "Adam" signifies in its original sense, *Man*, generically considered, and is used in Genesis accordingly with the article, contrary to what is common in the case of proper names; as Gen. 1: 27, "God created *man* (*the* Adam) in his own image, in the image of God created he him, male and female created he *them*." The clause ἐφ᾽ ᾧ, (to be resolved into *ἐπὶ τούτῳ, ὥστε*,) should be interpreted probably "for that" or "because that," and indicates that

universal sinfulness is the ground of the universal prevalence of death. This comes in the end substantially to the same thought.

2. Augustine found again a weighty argument for his doctrine in the fact of *infant baptism*, as practised in the church with the form, "*for the remission of sins*," and in connection with various ceremonies, exorcism in particular, implying that the child had been previously under the dominion of demoniacal powers. For as the child, before waking to self-consciousness, could have no actual sin, the forgiveness must have respect in this case immediately to hereditary sin and guilt. The Pelagians now did not reject infant baptism, and they ascribed to it also something more than a merely symbolical signification; they were in this respect far more under the influence of catholic tradition than their system could consistently allow. But still the baptismal form, "for the remission of sins" could have no meaning for them except in the case of adults, since they held that children came into the world without sin. The only force they could allow to infant baptism, would be that of ennobling and improving in some way a nature which was in itself already good. Hence, also, the doctrine which had come to prevail in the African church since the time of Cyprian, that infants dying without baptism are lost, appeared to them something shocking, as it converted God into an arbitrary tyrant. Pelagius would not indeed himself positively assert that they are saved, since our Lord in his conversation with Nicodemus declares baptism with water and with the Spirit to be the indispensable condition of an entrance into the kingdom of God; but of this much he was sure, that as innocent beings they could not be subjected by a righteous God to punishment (*quo non eant, scio, quo eant nescio*). Augustine replies to this, that there is no middle state between salvation and perdition, but different degrees only of one and the other. One must be either in communion with God and so in a state of salvation, or out of such communion and so in a contrary state. Augustine was undoubtedly the more consistent here on the ground of the biblico-ecclesiastical formula of baptism. In no case may we affirm infants to be saved on the ground of their own innocence, without the intervention of Christ's merit; since this would contradict the fundamental proposition of the gospel, that out of Christ there is no salvation. The Pelagians, to have been consistent, should have rejected infant baptism, and adopted the *baptistic* principle, that the apostolical formula, "for the remission of sins," is designed only for the baptism of adults. The belief, however, of the apostolic origin of infant baptism was then universal, and no one could venture therefore of course to propose any alteration of this form.

3. The testimony of the Bible and the church is confirmed by experience. As soon as the man wakes to self-consciousness, he finds in himself already a tendency to evil. Yea, even in the suckling are to be seen traces of self-will, pride and disobedience. The further the man advances in his moral development, the more clear it becomes to him that this disposition is something really evil and deserving of punishment, and not simply a limitation, for instance, in his finite nature. In the same way, also, we find even the child subjected to evil, to sickness, to death. It does violence to every right idea of God, to suppose this the original order of life. No, God must have created man without fault, and with a tendency towards good. The feeling that the human nature is not what it ought to be, pervades humanity as a whole. Augustine quotes in one place a passage from the third book of Cicero's Republic: "Nature has shown herself towards man not as a mother, but as a step-mother, since she has placed him in the world with a naked, frail and weakly body, and a mind that is anxious under burdens, dejected with all sorts of fear, indisposed to exertion, and inclined to enjoyment; yet we cannot fail to perceive a certain divine fire, that continues to glow in the heart, as underneath a heap of ruins." Cicero found fault with the work of nature. "He saw well the fact, but not the cause of it; for he had no conception of original sin, not being acquainted at all with the holy Scriptures."

To these positive arguments must be joined others of a negative character; that is, such as consist in the refutation of objections, raised partly by the Pelagians, and in part by Augustine himself in the dialectic development of his theory. The most important are the following:

1. If original sin is propagated by natural generation, it must be a *substance*, and then we fall into the error of the Manichaeans. Not so, replies Augustine; all nature is in itself good, so far as it is nature; evil is only the corruption of nature, a vitiation brought into its proper constitution.

2. If evil be not thus substantial, we might expect that the baptized and regenerate, in whom its power has been broken, would beget sinless children. The law which holds in the propagation of sin, should hold also certainly for the propagation of righteousness. But regeneration does not become complete in this life, in such a way as to exclude absolutely the action of sin. So in natural generation; the agency is not that of the regenerated spirit, but that of nature under the influence of concupiscence. "Regenerated parents pro-create, not as sons of God, but as children of the world." Augustine appeals also to analogies, particularly to this, that the wild olive grows from the

seed of the good olive, although the difference between the two trees is very great.

3. But if the pro-creation of children is not possible without fleshly lust, does it not follow that marriage must be condemned as bad? No; as nature is in itself good, so is also marriage, and the pro-creation of children that goes along with it. It is established in the opposite relation of the sexes. The blessing, "Be fruitful and multiply," the declaration "A man shall leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and they shall be one flesh," etc. flow from the state of paradise itself, and are not nullified by sin. The fleshly concupiscence is something that has come in since, which now indeed cleaves as an accident to the subject, but does not still overthrow the blessing of marriage. It becomes the duty now indeed of the regenerate, to bring this concupiscence into subordination, so that their children shall become at the same time children of God, that is, regenerate in Christ. Desire in this form Augustine terms, with reference to 1 Cor. 7: 3 ff., "a pardonable offence."

4. It contradicts the righteousness of God, to punish man for the sin of another; we are accountable only for sins, that are the act of our own will. This objection is very natural from the position of Pelagius, and has very clear force if we assume, with him, that the relation of Adam to his posterity is wholly external, and think of the imputation of his sin and guilt as a mechanical reckoning to their account of an isolated act merely, altogether foreign to their own lives. The same is true, as regards the imputation of the merit of Christ. So soon, however, as we think of humanity as a whole, and see in Adam the representative of the human nature, the bearer of his entire posterity, as Augustine does, the objection falls to the ground. But Pelagius, by reason of his abstract intellectual tendency, was not able to rise to this conception. At the same time, moreover, we have no right to sunder original sin abstractly from that which is actual. In the judgment of God, who always views the whole at once, the first takes in the last from the start, as the necessary form of its manifestation. Augustine and the older protestant theologians failed to lay sufficient emphasis on this point, and could not meet the objection in hand, therefore, with a full and satisfactory refutation. An abstract separation of original and actual sin, however, is entirely against his philosophical system, and involves, in fact, a transition to the atomistic position of Pelagius.

The corruption of sin then, according to Augustine, is universal, comprehending the race as well as individuals, grounded in the constitution of the will, extending from this to single actions, and from

these again reäcting upon the first, making every man the object of God's punitive justice. Still the corruption is not so great, as to have altered the substance of man, and destroyed his capability of redemption. This would have been the Manichaean error, the direct opposite of the Pelagian, which overthrows his *need* of redemption. "That is still good," says Augustine, "which deplores the good that is lost; for if some good were not left behind in our nature, sorrow for departed good could not be its punishment." Even in sin itself, the law of God is not wholly obliterated (Rom. 2: 14); and in the lives of the worst men there are some good works. But these contribute in no way to salvation. They are not truly good; the fountain is disturbed; "the virtues of the heathen are splendid sins." This seems a hard saying; and Julian endeavored to show its absurdity by drawing it out into preposterous consequences, which, however, serve only to show that he could not understand it. "If the chastity of the heathen," he said,[1] "be no chastity, we may as well say also that the body of an unbeliever is no body, that the eyes of the heathen cannot see, and that the grain which grows upon the fields of the heathen is no grain." Augustine, however, is altogether right, if we look to the principle of life, the inward mind by which it is ruled; and all, in fact, turns on this; it is to this he continually refers, never stopping, like Pelagius, in the outward deed, the mere matter of the action separately considered. What is not of faith is sin. The root, the impelling motive of all good actions, is the love of God, shed abroad in the heart, which to the unregenerate is altogether wanting. Thus, for instance, in his ingenious work on the City of God, Augustine shows happily that the fundamental character of the Romans was *egoism*. This produced at first, as the love of glory, those deeds that are so glorious in the view of the world, sacrifices for freedom and patriotism, in one word the old Roman virtues; subsequently, however, with the dissolution of all morality after the destruction of Carthage, the vices also of ancient Rome. Still he leaves room for the consoling supposition, that God may have had even among the heathen an elect people, whom he drew to himself by the mysterious operation of his Spirit, "true Israelites, not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." So also the Alexandrian fathers saw solitary rays of the Logos shining in the darkness of paganism; only they made by no means so clear a distinction between Christian and not Christian.

Thus all glorying on the part of men is excluded. Man is sick, even unto death, out of Christ; he is, however, capable of redemption and cure; and in proportion to the greatness of the disease, is

[1] In Aug. Opus imperf. I. c. 27.

the greatness of the physician also, and the adorable fulness of the universal remedy, redeeming grace. This now claims our consideration.

§ 3. *The Doctrine of Grace and Redemption.*

Pelagius distinguishes in the idea of the good three elements, ability, will and being. The first belongs to nature, the second to freedom, the third to the act. Ability, or the power of good, what may be styled moral capacity, is grace, and comes from God, in the way of necessary natural endowment; forming thus the foundation for will and being, without, however, making them necessary in the same way. These, will and being, depend wholly upon man.[1] For example: "the power of seeing with our eyes depends not on ourselves, but, on the other hand, it does depend on ourselves whether we shall see well or otherwise."

This would seem to make revelation entirely superfluous. Pelagius, however, affirms no such consequence. Along with the natural ground, which we may denominate moral capacity, he assumes also the accession of auxiliary grace, showing its force negatively in the forgiveness of sin, and positively in the strengthening influence of instruction and example. This is revelation, both as law and gospel. "In the case of one who is not a Christian," he tells us, "goodness is found in a naked state, without help; but with the Christian, it is made complete by the assistance of Christ." Still more plainly: "At first men lived righteously according to nature, afterwards under the law, and finally under grace (the gospel). When the inward law (conscience) was no longer sufficient, the outward law came. Then again, when this (the Mosaic law), by reason of the preponderance of sinful habit, was no longer sufficient, help must be sought in the lively force of nature as exhibited for imitation in the example of the Lord."

This grace, Pelagius teaches further, must be merited, since God otherwise would be unrighteous. "The heathen are subjected to judgment and damnation, because notwithstanding their free will, by which they have it in their power to attain to faith and to merit God's grace, they make an evil use of the freedom they possess; Christians, on the other hand, are worthy of reward, because by the proper use of their freedom they merit the grace of the Lord and keep his commandments."

[1] *Pelagius in August. de gratia Christi* c. 4: Primum illud, id est posse, ad Deum proprie pertinet, qui illud creaturae suae contulit, duo vero reliqua, hoc est velle et esse, ad hominem referenda sunt, quia de arbitrii fonte descendunt.

This passage implies, besides, that the grace of revelation is not absolutely necessary. Moral capacity and freedom are of themselves sufficient for fulfilling the divine commandments. The grace of the gospel is not that which first makes it possible to do good; it only renders this more easy. Celestius accordingly affirmed quite consistently: *gratiam Dei non ad singulos actus dari.* Being closely pressed on this point by Augustine, Pelagius did indeed pronounce an anathema on those who deny the necessity of the grace of God in Christ, at every moment and for every action; but this was an admission forced from him in controversy, which was not in keeping with his own premises.

Since Pelagius had so high an opinion of the moral nature of man, as to consider the grace of Christianity useful only, not absolutely indispensable, we need not be surprised at his declaration, that there were men even *before* Christ, who, by a proper development of their moral powers, and the right use of their free will, had lived in perfect holiness. In his Commentary on Rom. 5: 12, he says that the word "all" designates only the majority of men, without including the righteous few, such as Abel, Isaac and Jacob. In his book on free will, he made use of the superstitious veneration which already prevailed for the Virgin Mary in favor of this assertion, and made it a necessary part of piety to look upon her as free from sin.[1]

These views serve fully to expose the superficial character of the Pelagian thinking. We have in the first place the same atomistic tendency, which we have found already sundering Adam from his posterity, an act of the will from other acts, and also from the state of the will; separating here too, with like abstraction, ability from will and being, so as to derive one entirely from God, and the other two entirely from man. But moral ability, the power of virtue, holds not beside and beyond the will and its acts, but in them; it is not something finished and complete, but is to be unfolded and advanced by exercise and application; so that man also is concerned in its production. On the other hand, will and being are not to be excluded from ability and the divine coöperation. It comes out here that Pelagius is properly a *deist*, who denies the permanent creating activity of God, nay, in the end, his efficient omnipresence itself. He conceives of the world and of man as a clock, which, after it has been fixed and

[1] *Aug. de natura et gratia contra Pelagium*, § 42: quamdicit (Pelag.) sine peccato confiteri necesse est pietati. He employs also the argumentum a silentio, inferring that the righteous whose sins are not mentioned in the Scripture, were free from sin: de illis quorum justitiae meminit (Script. Sacra), et peccatorum sine dubio meminisset si qua eos peccasse sensisset.

wound up by God, runs on without his help by the independent force of its own machinery. God's relation to it is that of an inactive spectator. Such an abstract separation of God and the world is something still much worse, because more lifeless and godless, than pantheism, which confounds them both together. Declarations like these: "In him we live, move, and have our being," "Without his will not a sparrow falls to the ground, but even the very hairs of your head are all numbered," "God works in us both to will and to do," "We will come unto him and make our abode with him," "I am the vine, ye are the branches; whoso abideth in me and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without me ye can do nothing;" these and such like glorious and precious declarations of Scripture, we say, have, from this deistic position, no meaning whatever, but must be resolved into mere oriental figure and hyperbole. In the controversy itself the difference was not indeed carried back to its deepest ground, in this view of the relation between God and the world, the Creator and the creature; Jerome, however, had some sense of it, for he charges the Pelagians, in one place, with denying the absolute dependence of man on God, and brings against them the word of Christ, John 5: 17, concerning the uninterrupted working of God.

It stands equally bad with the Pelagian view of Christian grace. This is sunk to a mere outward help, and resolves itself at last into doctrine and example. It is thus in fact nothing more than "the finger board on the way of life." That Christianity includes doctrine, and that Christ is our example, admits of no doubt. But however much we may make of such doctrine and example, they by no means exhaust the import of our religion. Else would Christ not be specifically different from Moses, Socrates, or any other virtuous sage, and so could not be our Redeemer. The main fact is rather, that in the character of God-man, as prophet, priest and king, he is the author of a new creation, and has imparted to humanity a higher life; that he not only operates upon believers from without, but lives and moves in them as the principle of their spiritual existence. Of this, Pelagius had no apprehension. What signifies the proclamation of a new doctrine, or the exhibition of a lofty example, if to men pining under the dominion of sin there be not granted at the same time power to follow them? Solon, Pythagoras, Socrates, Seneca, Confucius, with all their practical wisdom and moral rules, could not still convert the world. Augustine may well say: "Would that Pelagius might acknowledge that grace, which not only promises us the riches of future glory, but produces faith and hope in regard to the same; a grace that

does not merely exhort, but inwardly inclines also, to all good; that does not simply reveal wisdom, but infuses also love to it."[1]

When, finally, Pelagius teaches, that grace must be merited, and that it is imparted to us, accordingly, after the measure of our natural virtue, he overthrows thus its proper nature altogether. Grace and merit mutually exclude each other. "To him that worketh," says Paul, "is the reward not reckoned of grace but of debt; but to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness," (Rom. 5: 4, 5). "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast," (Eph. 2: 8, 9).

We see here the comprehensive importance of the controversy. Pelagianism robs Christianity of its specific dignity, the gospel of its all renovating life, Christ of his divine nature; and leads thus by necessary consequence to the system of naturalism and rationalism, by which the very foundations of our most holy faith are undermined. Since, however, it has no right conception of sin, this is the only result that could be expected. If human nature be not corrupt, and free will prepared for every good work, we need no Redeemer, to begin all anew, but simply a reformer to improve what is at hand, and salvation becomes properly the work of man.

If Augustine had done nothing more than to overcome, negatively and positively, this fundamental heresy, he would be entitled for this alone to the everlasting gratitude of the universal church.

The doctrine of Augustine. He comes in a two-fold way to his peculiar view of redeeming grace. In the first place, by rising upwards, according to the law of antithesis, from the view he takes of the utter incapacity of the unregenerate man for good. The greater the corruption, the more mighty must be the principle that brings relief. The doctrine of grace is thus simply the positive counterpart of the doctrine of sin. Secondly, he reaches the same result, by descending from his conception of the all-efficient, all-pervading, presence of God, in natural and still more in spiritual life. Whilst with Pelagius God and the world, after the work of creation, are deistically sundered from one another, and man placed on an independent footing, Augustine, before this controversy even, by reason of his speculative spirit and the earnestness of his own experience, was deeply penetrated with a sense of the absolute dependence of the creature upon the Creator, in whom we live, and move, and have our being. Still, this sense of the immanence of God in the world has with him no pantheistic form, leading him to

[1] De gratia Christi. c. 10.

deny God's *transcendence* and independence of the world. He holds the right medium between deism and pantheism, under the guidance of the holy Scriptures and the spirit of the church. In the very beginning of his Confessions, he says beautifully: "How shall I call upon my God, my God and my Lord? I must call him into myself, when I call upon him; and what place is there in me into which my God may enter, the God who has created heaven and earth? O Lord my God, is there then anything in me that may contain thee? But do heaven and earth, which thou hast made and in which thou hast made me, contain thee? Or inasmuch as whatever is would not be without thee, does it follow that thou art contained in all? Since then I also am, why do I pray that thou shouldst come into me, who would not myself be, if thou wert not in me. I am not still in hades, and yet even there thou art. For if I should make my bed in hell, behold thou art there! I would not be therefore, my God, I would not be at all, unless thou wert in me. Yea, rather I would not be, if I were not in thee, of whom are all things, by whom are all things, in whom are all things. So is it, O Lord, even so!" In short, man is nothing without God, and all in and by God. This fundamental feeling could not fail to urge our church father into all the doctrines which he has so profoundly asserted and unfolded in opposition to Pelagianism.

Grace is above all, according to Augustine, the power of a divine *creation* in Christ, renovating man from within. Its operation holds first, negatively, in the remission of sin, by which the way is thrown open for communion with God; and then, positively, also in the communication of a new principle of life. As we have inherited from the first Adam our sinful and mortal life, so the second Adam also implants in us, by the Holy Ghost, the germ of a sinless and immortal life, from God and in God. Positive grace works then not simply, as according to the view of Pelagius, from without, by instruction and exhortation, upon our understanding; but descends into the centre of our personality, and imparts to the will, at the same time, power to obey the truth which is taught, and to follow the pattern exhibited by Christ.[1] Augustine styles it, hence, an *inspiratio bonae voluntatis atque operis*;[2] also, *inspiratio dilectionis*.[3] The unwilling it meets to make him willing; the willing it follows after, that he may not will in

[1] Non lege atque doctrina insonante forinsecus, sed interna et occulta, mirabili ac ineffabili potestate operari Deum in cordibus hominum, non solum veras revelationes, sed bonas etiam voluntates, (*de grat. Christ.* c. 24).

[2] *De corr. et grat.* 3.

[3] *C. duas epp. Pelag.* IV. 11.

vain.[1] In short, grace is the marrow and blood of the new man; from it proceeds all that is truly good and divine; and without it we can do nothing that is acceptable to God.

From this fundamental idea of grace, the particular characteristics ascribed to it by Augustine, in opposition to Pelagius, follow as natural consequences.

It is, in the first place, absolutely necessary to Christian virtue; not something by which it is facilitated merely, but the *conditio sine qua non* of its existence. It is necessary "for every good disposition, for every good thought, for every good word of man, at every moment." Without it, the Christian life can neither begin, nor continue, nor become complete.

It is, again, undeserved. Grace would be no grace (*gratia*), if it were not gratuitous, *gratis data*. As man can do nothing good without grace, he is, of course, also not in a state to merit grace, which itself would be something good. "What merit could we have at the time, when we did not yet love God? That we might obtain the love with which we should love, we have been ourselves loved when this love was still not ours. We could never have been able to love God, had we not received such love from him who first loved us, and because he loved us first. But what could we do that is good, without such love? Or how should we not do good, with such love?" "The Holy Ghost operates where he will, and does not follow merit, but first causes it to exist." Grace accordingly is imparted to man, not "*because* he is already a believer, but *in order that* he may become a believer; not *because* he has merited it by good works, but that he may *thereby* be qualified for good works. Pelagius reverses the natural order, by putting the cause for the effect and the effect for the cause. The ground of our salvation can rest only in God himself, if he is to remain fully absolute. Augustine appeals to examples of pardoned sinners, "where not only no good deserts, but evil only, had gone before." So to the case of the apostle Paul: "Alienated from the faith which he sought to destroy, and violently influenced against it, he was suddenly, by the superiority of grace, converted to faith, and in such way that he was not only transformed from an enemy into a friend, but from a persecutor also into a bearer of persecution for the sake of that faith which he had himself once persecuted. For to him it was granted by Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake." He appeals further to the case of children, who without volition, and so without previous merit of the

[1] Nolentem praevenit ut velit, volentem subsequitur, ne frustra velit, (*Enchir.* c. 32).

will, are incorporated by holy baptism into the kingdom of grace. His own experience, finally, was to himself, at least, an incontrovertible argument, for the free and boundless mercy of God. When in other places he speaks, notwithstanding, of desert, he refers to good works which the Holy Ghost works in men, and which God rewards out of grace, so that eternal life is grace for grace. "Since all our deserts of a good kind are God's gifts, God crowns thy deserts not as thy deserts, but as his own gifts of grace."

Grace, still further, is irresistible, as proceeding from the almighty will of God.[1] This consequence unfolded itself with Augustine in the course of the controversy; it is so closely connected, however, with the doctrine of predestination, that it cannot be judged of thoroughly except in this connection.

Its operation, again, is progressive or by degrees. Grace overthrows all the consequences of the fall; but in regular order, corresponding with the gradual evolution of the believer's life. It is a tutoress, who accommodates herself wisely and lovingly to the existing wants of her pupil. Augustine gives to these different stages of grace, appropriate particular names. First, it overcomes the rebellious will, and produces a lively longing after redemption. This is *gratia praeveniens* or *praeparans*. Secondly, it creates faith and free will towards good, as *gratia operans*. Thirdly, as *gratia coöperans*, it wrestles, along with the liberated will, against the remaining power of evil, and brings forth good works as the fruit of faith. Finally, it enables the believer to continue in good on to the end. This is the *donum perseverantiae*, the only sure criterion of the elect.[2] "We call ourselves elect or children of God, as we so style all whom we see leading, as regenerate persons, an evidently pious life. But only then are we in truth what we are called, when we persevere in that on whose account we have our name." So long, then, as any one continues to live, no sure judgment can have place with regard to him in this respect. Perseverance even unto death, that is, on to the point where the danger of falling away ceases, is grace in the most emphatic sense; "since it is more difficult to possess this gift than any other, although for him, to whom nothing is hard, it is as easy to impart this as that."

As regards, finally, the relation of grace to freedom, they by no means exclude each other, though they seem to do so. For we have

[1] Divina gratia indeclinabiliter et insuperabiliter agitur (voluntas humana). *De corr. et grat.* 12.

[2] Putting the three last stages together he says: Coöperando perficit, quod operando incipit. Ipse ut velimus operatur incipiens, qui volentibus coöperatur perficiens (*De grat. et lib. arbit.* § 33).

already seen, that Augustine takes the idea of freedom commonly in its highest form, as will for the good. This is here still defective, being obstructed by the action of remaining sin. But in the state of glory all possibility of evil will be at an end, and moral freedom will thus become complete, and like the freedom of God.[1] Since now man, according to Augustine, is in consequence of the fall incapable of good, freedom in this higher sense is itself a gift of grace, and its development runs parallel with the revelation of grace in the process of sanctification. We may say thus, that in his system freedom is the subjective correlate of objective grace. He appeals for illustration to the relation of the eye to light. "As the eye of the body, even when most sound, can see nothing without the light of day, so man also cannot live aright without grace from above. . . . The eye is sufficient for itself not to see, that is, for darkness; but to see with its light, it requires the help of the clear light from without." "Both, believing and willing, are the work of God, inasmuch as God disposes man to them; but both are also the work of man, since neither the one nor the other can take place without our coöperation." This, by the way, is not in full agreement with what he says of the irresistible character of grace. The union of freedom and grace, Augustine finds in love, which is at once objective and subjective, passive and active, being apprehended and apprehending at the same time.

In the way of brief retrospect, we may reduce Augustine's doctrine, as now unfolded, to the three following points of view: 1. The primitive state—immediate union of man with God, childlike innocence, pure germ and presupposition of all that should follow, possibility of a sinless and also of a sinful development. 2. The state of sin—rupture with God, condition of bondage, dominion of death, with a longing, however, after redemption. 3. Redemption or grace—higher union with God, virtue conscious of itself through conflict, liberty of the children of God, attended here still indeed with the remains of sin and death, but absolutely complete in the next world without the possibility of relapse.

So far those reformed churches in which the authority of Calvin reigns, can follow in all material points the doctrine of Augustine. But it belongs to his peculiar character besides, though not properly as any part of the Pelagian controversy, that all these evangelical views of sin and grace are closely joined in him with a strong church

[1] *De corr. et grat.* 33: Prima ergo libertas voluntatis erat posse non peccare, novissima erit multo major, non posse peccare. On the distinctions in Augustine's conception of liberty, see *J. Ritter, Geschichte der Philosophie*, Th. VI. S. 348 ff. and *J. Muller, Der Lehre von der Sünde*, Bd. II. S. 36 ff.

feeling; and here we meet the catholic element of his system. Though grace, accordingly, be wholly supernatural in its origin and nature, it still does not work magically or abruptly, but through the medium of the actually existing Catholic church and its institutions. Out of the church there is absolutely no salvation, but in it are deposited all saving powers, in the form, as it were, of real flesh and blood. In particular he ascribes to baptism, taken of course in the closest connection with the word and the Holy Ghost, an importance and force, that come into conflict in some measure with his own doctrine of election, and have been only partially admitted in the Protestant church. It is for him, emphatically, the sacrament of grace and regeneration, by which the guilt of sin is taken away, and the life of Christ implanted in the soul.[1] He makes salvation absolutely to depend upon it, although he cannot avoid allowing an exception in favor of the thief on the cross, and of such martyrs as without their own fault were prevented by death from being baptized. In these cases, the baptism of blood supplied the place of the usual rite. From the doctrine of the absolute necessity of baptism sprang as a natural consequence, the tenet affirming the damnation of all unbaptized children, as actually pronounced by the council of Carthage in the year 418; it is remarkable, however, that this passage appears only in a part of the manuscripts.

As in the whole system and personal character of Augustine then, so particularly also in the doctrines now reviewed, two distinct tendencies evidently prevail, a catholic and a protestant. The Roman Catholic church, on which he has exerted an incalculable influence, held fast the *churchly* and sacramental element, and carried it out so *one-sidedly*, that not only the doctrine of predestination, which never came to any general symbolical acknowledgment in her communion, but gradually also the doctrine of the exclusiveness of grace in the work of conversion and sanctification was abandoned; so that, if not in theory yet at least in practice, Pelagianism was again admitted into the Roman communion, as though the temporary favor shown towards it by pope Zosimus had carried in it a deep prophetical meaning. Along with the Tridentine and Jesuitic tendency in the Roman church, however, there has been and is still to some extent a Jansenist party, adhering with simple attachment to the Augustinian doctrines, though

[1] *Ep.* 98. 2: Aqua exhibens forinsecus sacramentum gratiae, et spiritus operans intrinsecus beneficium gratiae, solvens vinculum culpae, reconcilians bonum naturae, regenerant hominem in uno Christo, ex uno Adam generatum. *De pecc. mer* I. 39—abluti per sacramentum—ac sic incorporati Christi corpori quod est ecclesiae, reconciliantur Deo, ut in illo vivi, ut salvi, ut redempti, ut illuminati fiunt.

without a will to carry them out on either side in the way of further development.

The Orthodox Protestant churches took up once more Augustine's opposition to Pelagianism, that is, the evangelical element of his system, in its whole force, and turned it against the abuses of the papacy as they prevailed at the time. They incorporated his doctrines on the primitive state, original sin and hereditary guilt, in all essential points, into their symbols. As regards the doctrine of grace, however, we find a difference, not so much in the way of deviation as of further development. Augustine's representation labors under a double defect. In the first place, the doctrine is held predominantly under an objective form; it does not unfold sufficiently the process of salvation, especially the nature of faith and justification. The last is not with him a declarative act, as with the reformers, but is confounded with the idea of making righteous, or sanctification. On this side, the Lutheran church has partly modified and partly carried forward his doctrine, in the evangelical protestant spirit, even to the point indeed of an abstract disjunction of justification from sanctification; at the same time, however, in the Form of Concord, excluding his doctrine of predestination. In this last respect she approximates towards the church of Rome, as attempting a middle course between Augustinianism and Pelagianism; witness the Synergism of Melanchthon, which was indeed condemned by the same Form of Concord, but has found, notwithstanding, many defenders among the Lutheran theologians. Luther, who is known to have been a decided predestinarian, stands in this respect in a similar relation to his church with that of Augustine to the church of Rome. The Lutheran church stands nearer than the reformed to the Roman in this also, that she has retained the Augustinian doctrine of baptism, and so substantially the sacramental element of his system. The same is true of the English Episcopal church, at least as represented in her Book of Common Prayer. The other defect of Augustine's system lies in his doctrine of predestination; inasmuch as it stops in the infralapsarian view, half-way, while yet the premises on which it is made to rest lead by necessary consequence to supralapsarianism. This point, the reformed church of the Calvinistic confession has taken hold of with special emphasis, at the expense, however, of the *churchly* sacramental element, pushing it out with bold consequence to the most rigorous extreme; while the German Reformed and English Episcopal churches, which are not so fully under the doctrinal influence of Calvin as the French, Low Dutch and Scotch, feeling deeply the difficulty of the problem, have wisely left it open to individual freedom, as a question for solution hereafter,

when the ripening spirit of the church may yet succeed in explaining the relation of the divine and human activity, more satisfactorily than has yet been done by most symbols, by whose premature determinations one or the other side is always made to suffer.

It is precisely this remarkable union of two apparently conflicting tendencies which forms the ground of the peculiar greatness of Augustine, and of that widely extended influence he still continues to exercise over the whole Christian world. Both tendencies, the *churchly*, sacramental, objective, or in one word catholic, and the evangelical, *spiritualistic*, subjective, in one word protestant, have in themselves deep truth and immense living force, as is shown conclusively by all church history. But both have also their peculiar dangers. The first, *one-sidedly* carried out, conducts to Romanism, with all its errors; the second, developed in opposition to the church, runs over easily, through the medium of abstract supernaturalism, into absolute rationalism; and these two extremes then, as usual, again meet each other. The church without Christianity is a body without a soul; Christianity without the church is a soul without the body. The conception of man, however, includes one as well as the other, contents and form together; the two sides can stand also, only so far as each, though it may be unwillingly, has part in the other. The truth holds in the organic and indissoluble union of both; and now to accomplish this, and so, in the spirit of Augustine, to transcend his own still defective system, yea, to surmount the whole *antipodal* development thus far of Catholicism and Protestantism, by the exclusion of their respective errors and a living, inward reconciliation of their truth—this, we say, appears to be the grand task and mission for the church of the present and the future.

ARTICLE II.

TOUR FROM BEIRÛT TO ALEPPO IN 1845.

By Rev. W. M. Thomson, Missionary at Beirût. [Concluded from No. 17, p. 23.]

Oct. 25th. About 2 o'clock last night we were waked up by some horsemen sent by the governor of Sâfetâ to demand who we were, and what was our business. They at first talked loud and impudently,—wondered how we dared to enter their country without permission, etc.

After holding a private conference with our horseman from Abood Beg, they came and apologized for their insolence—said they were not sent to look after us, but, as *howalies* upon the Sheikh. They however left us before morning, and were no doubt sent by the governor as spies upon our proceedings. The people throughout these regions are remarkably suspicious, and will never give an answer to the simplest question if they can avoid it. Perhaps the utter secrecy of their religion develops into universal reserve. I suspect however that it is more a result of general insecurity and universal oppression, under which they have groaned for ages. If these poor wretches see us take notes, they make off as fast as possible. When we arrive at a village we are assured, with an infinite profusion of oaths, that the people have nothing either to eat or to sell—have neither bread, eggs, chickens, barley, straw, nor anything else. But by little and little, confidence is established, and diplomatic relations settled on an amicable basis—eggs and all other eatables for man and beast are discovered and brought out with surprising effrontery, and being actually paid for, the owners appear to be as much puzzled as delighted. This state of things speaks of enormous oppression and robbery on the part of the rulers, and the testimony is corroborated by a thousand other witnesses.

It was well we did not attempt to reach Sâfetâ last night. By daylight, with the castle in full view, we could not find the way without a guide. We have again come upon trap, and the traveller from the south finds himself involved in a labyrinth of impracticable gorges, and passes that are impassable. As on the south of N. Kebeer, the rents and seams made in the strata by the obtrusion of trap dykes appear in general to run east and west, and hence it is difficult to get across the country from south to north.

Sâfetâ is a considerable village—better built than usual, and has 101 taxable Greeks and 58 Moslems. The district is large and populous. There are 332 villages containing 310 taxable Moslems, 5820 Ansairiyeh, 815 Greeks, 81 Maronites; which multiplied by 5 gives 35,075 as the entire population. The Burj, which we have had in view for two days, occupies the top of a conical trap hill which it entirely covers. The sides of this hill are built up by heavy masonry of Roman work to the height of about forty feet. This was done to enlarge the top and give symmetry to the castle, which assumes the shape of an oblong octagon, 172 paces from east to west and 140 from north to south at their greatest diameters. The circumference of the whole is 564 paces. The outer wall inclines inward at an angle of about 75° until near the top, whence it is carried up perpendicularly,

and was originally finished with projecting parapets. It was protected by a walled ditch thirty-five feet wide. Between the great wall and the trap rock, which receded in the inside, vaults were constructed extending nearly, if not quite round the castle. The upper surface was levelled off, making a splendid terrace. Upon this terrace, and nearest the east end, stands the Burj or tower. It is 101 feet 10 inches long from east to west, and 59 feet 3 inches wide, and its present height is 82½ feet. This lofty building is constructed of large smooth cut stone. The stones of the uppermost course on the battlements, are ten feet long by two square, and some in the lower part of the Burj are much larger. The walls at the base are twelve feet thick, solid, and at the top eight feet six inches. The Burj is divided into two stories. The lower one is a church bearing the name of Mar Mekhial. The lofty vault is supported by two massy square, or *clustered* columns, with half pillars in the angles. The entire east end is one grand circular nave, simple, bold and quite impressive. The only entrance to the Burj is the low door of this church, at the west end, and it is lighted by tall lancet windows. The ascent to the second story is by an admirably vaulted stairway *in* the southern wall. This is also one large room, whose vault is supported by three clustered columns with half columns in the angles, as below. The work here however is more elaborate, and is adorned with pedestals and cornice. This was evidently designed as a place of refuge and defence, in times of danger; a church militant fitted not merely for spiritual contests, but also to sustain the rude encounters of a grosser warfare.

Near the door of the church is a cistern hewn in the solid rock sixty feet long, thirty wide, and thirty deep. A flight of steps conducts to the bottom. It is now dry and the reverberation of the slightest noise is long in subsiding, and a pistol fired off is rather a dangerous experiment upon the strength of one's tympanum.

The part of these remains most interesting to the antiquary, is on the east end of the *octagon*, but *outside* of it. Here are very heavy foundations and some high walls of the pure old Jewish and Phenician bevel, identical in size and style with the foundations of the temple at Jerusalem. A portion of these works has the name Kusr Bint el-Melek. These foundations appear never to have been disturbed from their first position in a remote antiquity. There are several remarkable windows now walled up. They are narrow, tall, and the arch running to a point as though the value and power of the keystone had not been understood. Above these foundations a more modern building once stood, the remnants of whose elegantly turned arches

are seen from the east side of the ruins. If I ventured to speculate on such subjects I would suggest, that at the Kusr we have a specimen of ancient Phenician work, built probably by the Arvadites, whose island and city are directly below it. This castle commands the pass and road from Arvad and Tortosa over the mountain to Hamah. The great octagon is a splendid example of Roman work. Their object in keeping up and strengthening the fortifications of this pass is sufficiently obvious. The Burj, half church, half castle, was probably erected (out of Roman wrought stone found on the premises) about the troublous times which succeeded the early Moslem invasions; that is, about the middle of the seventh century. It is barely possible that it may have been erected by the crusaders who possessed Tortosa, as a frontier church and castle. The Arabic works found on and about the castle do not merit any particular notice.

The rock used in building the Burj is white limestone, semi-crystalline and highly fossiliferous—pectens, cones, venuses and other existing shells abound in it. The view from the top is vast, varied, and magnificent over plains and hills, over mountains and valleys east, west, north, south; and far across the dark blue sea to Cyprus. We took many bearings, but only a few of them appear to be of importance. Tripoli Point, 39. Ras es-Shukah, 42. Highest point of Lebanon, 3. Kulaet Husn, 120. To Kulaet Husn is 5 hours, to Tortosa 6, Arca 7, Tripoli 12½. Burj Husn Solyman is out of sight to the north-east about six hours. The people urged us to visit this castle. Many of the stones are thirty feet long by ten wide, and there are long Greek inscriptions. Whether these reports are all true or not the castle is well worth visiting, but our time was too limited.

Scattered over the hills around Sâfetâ are a great number of castles and towers, most of them ancient and in ruins; and nearly every conspicuous point is covered by a white tomb of an Ansairiyeh saint. These are all places of pilgrimage and prayer. So far from having no places for devotion, these poor people have more than any other sect in the country.

We reached Tortosa in 5 hours 15 minutes' rapid riding. The road is a continued descent along the bed of the N. Gumkeh, which rises to the north-east of Sâfetâ and falls into the sea a mile to the south of Tortosa near a large artificial mound. There are but few villages on this road, owing to scarcity of water in the dry season. Ain el-Kesm is an hour and ten minutes from Sâfetâ. Ain es-Sifsâfeh 2¼ hours. The ruins of Rehaneah are 2½ from Sâfetâ. There appears to have been a temple with columns at this place; its history

is unknown. The hills in this neighborhood are beautifully rounded off as if by art, and well wooded. The rock is limestone with occasional localities of pudding-stone and argilaceous schist. In the valley of the Gumkeh there is an immense quantity of chert, quartz, chalcedony, and jasper geodes and pebbles, some of them very pretty, but I had no time to gather, and no means to carry them.

Tortosa or Tartoos.

Oct. 26. This is generally supposed to be the Arethusa or Orthosia of Strabo and the Itineraries.[1] Strabo however appears to place it south of the river Eleutherus, but I heard of no ruins near that river bearing this or any kindred name. There is some confusion in the order in which the cities on this part of the coast are mentioned by ancient authors, as we shall see hereafter.

Though once a large city, Tortosa is now a mean village of 241 taxable Moslems and 44 Greeks. The district of Tortosa or Tartoos, as it is called by the Arabs, is small, containing only four villages with a population of 439 Moslems and 116 Christians, making an aggregate of 2775. The inhabitants of Tortosa live mostly within the castle or strong hold of the city, which was defended by a double wall with salient towers, and was further protected by a double ditch cut in the rock. The width of the ditch between the two walls was 63 feet; outside the outer wall it is 40 wide and 12 deep. Both the walls were built of heavy *beveled* stones which still rest on their original foundations of solid rock. The outer wall is at one place more than sixty feet high at the present time, and *was* higher—the most imposing specimen of Phenician fortification in Syria. The side towards the sea had but one wall, still in good preservation. The base has been strengthened, probably by the Romans, by a heavy wall of smooth cut stones, built against it at an angle of about 60°. In other parts this more modern work has been built *into* the ancient, so that the latter *appears* to rest upon the former, which would confuse the chronology of the place. A careful examination detects the mistake. I regard the ruins of Tortosa with peculiar interest, as they appear to me to decide the question as to which style of architecture is most ancient. The Greek or Roman, and the more modern works are here manifestly built *upon* the heavy *beveled* walls, which are believed to

[1] So Maundrell and others, but incorrectly. The ancient name of the city was *Antaradus*. This Arabic geographers write *Antartûs* and *Antarsûs;* whence the common Arabic name *Tartûs*, in Italian *Tortosa*. The ancient Orthosia was twelve Roman miles from Tripoli, probably at the Nahr Bârid.—Eds.

be Phenician. The Jews built in the same style, as is clearly seen at Jerusalem, and a few other places in Palestine.

The form of the city was a rectangular, and nearly equilateral parallelogram. The eastern wall was built somewhat irregularly and appears never to have been completed according to the original design. These walls were constructed of very large, smooth cut stones after the Roman model, on the north and east sides, but the south wall was less substantial. Probably it is more modern, built about the same time as the cathedral, possibly to enlarge the bounds of the city in order to include the cathedral. Outside the whole ran a wide and well walled ditch. The circuit of the wall is 1400 paces.

The main entrance to the castle is at the north-west angle, close to the sea, which rendered any assault upon it very difficult. It still strikes the beholder with surprise, and inspires respect by its great solidity and obvious antiquity. In Maundrell's time the gate was reached by a draw-bridge over the outer ditch; *now* the approach is by a substantial stone arch. The gate opens into a large room, whose vault is supported by handsome clustered arches. The centre stone over the door has a somewhat defaced symbolical sign like the ace of clubs deeply cut in the rock, and there are many single words and parts of sentences dimly carved on the walls, but there are no inscriptions of any significancy. Crossing the inner fosse you enter through the second wall, into the open court of the castle, passing on the left hand the large hall mentioned by Maundrell, 155 feet long and 56 wide. The walls of it are seven feet thick, and the vault or roof was supported by five granite columns, upon which rested as many clustered arches springing out of the walls on either side. The decorations were of a mixed order, and indifferent taste. The base of the arches appears to have had the human head wrought upon them. The front of this great hall had originally six large windows. The one in the centre was adorned with Corinthian columns, and had the figure of a lamb carved above it. I cannot think it was ever a church. There was too much light; the ornaments are not ecclesiastical; there is no nave, although the east end remains entire. There is a neat church a short distance east of it, plainly of the same age and style. The tradition of the place is, that this great hall was built by king Dokeanos for an audience chamber, and for public offices. Who is Dokeanos? The governor tells me that there were two kings called Dokeanos. One was a Jew, called also Hâkîm; this was "a long time ago." The more modern was a Christian, who built the cathedral, this great hall, and the church mentioned above. Do you now know who Dokeanos is, this king of yore? now that his legal successor, this con-

descending Moslem governor, Muhammed el-Beg, has told you? I do not. Alas for human greatness! This same hall has witnessed strange doings in its day. The last paragraph in its history relates to the bombardment by the English in 1840, to dislodge a company of Ibrahim Pasha's troops. Many balls struck it, and one large one lies imbedded in the wall over the west window. Several Arab huts, miserable and mean, have lately been built in the east end of it, and the spacious vaults below are used for stables.

We spent this afternoon in examining the vast quarries, five or six miles to the south of Tortosa. Their prodigious extent astonishes and perplexes the curious visitor. We rode for hours amongst them. Pococke makes rather too grand an affair of his idol temple cut out of the solid rock. It is but one of the hundred quarries to be seen hereabouts, having the sides cut down a little more regularly than the rest. The block of solid rock left in the centre, and subsequently converted into the throne of an idol, is found in many others. But the canopy placed upon this base, beneath which the god reposed, is not found elsewhere. The base of this throne is 17 feet by 16 feet 7½ inches high. Above this, on the east, south and west sides, two courses of thick stone are laid, leaving the north side open. The whole is covered with one huge stone, 14 feet 4 inches by 12 feet 8 inches, and 7 feet thick, concave below, like a canopy; and under it no doubt sat the idol, facing the north. The court is about 150 feet square, and open on the north. The sepulchral monuments so well described by Maundrell, still rear their gigantic figures in this dreary desert. One is thirty-three feet high, pedestal fifteen feet square, and ten high, then a shaft or column, surmounted by a pyramid. The other is thirty feet high, the pedestal sixteen feet square, and the corners supported by four huge misshapen lions, more defaced than when Maundrell saw them. The sepulchres underneath so exactly resemble those at Lodakîa, and other places hereafter to be described, that I shall pass them without remark at present.

About a mile south of these sepulchres, is a square monument altogether unique, and well worth examination. The base is 32 feet by 31½, and rises about four feet above the ground. Above the base it is 28 feet 2 inches, by 27 feet 6 inches, having two courses of stone, each stone 14 feet 9 inches long, by 8 feet 5 inches high. Over these are two other courses of smaller stones, and the whole finished by a very graceful cornice. The entire monument forms a nearly perfect cube, height, width and length equal. It is divided into two stories, and the roof and floor are composed of two great slabs of stone placed side by side. To each room there is a small window on the north side.

Standing altogether alone in this desert, amidst sand-heaps and myrtle jungle, it is a very solemn and impressive object.

After all, the quarries themselves form the greatest curiosity. What became of this prodigious amount of stone? No satisfactory answer can be gathered from the ruins of Tortosa and Ruad. Stone sufficient to build ten such cities has been quarried from this locality. As the Arvadites were great mariners, and this rock is a soft sandstone conglomerate easily wrought, and near the sea, perhaps it formed a great article of export. The fact that this kind of stone is met with in nearly all the cities along the coast, may favor such a supposition. This neighborhood is called by the Arabs Amreed or Maabed Amreet, 'the fane of Amreet.' This name the Greeks probably changed into Marathus, and the old vaults, foundations, sarcophagi, etc. near the 'Ain el-Hîyeh (Serpent's Fountain), may mark the precise locality of ancient Marathus. From remotest times the Arvadites must have fortified their landing and watering places on the main land; which are still at 'Ain el-Hîyeh (Amreet or Marathus), and Nahr Gumkeh at Tortosa. To this day whoever holds these places can compel the Arvadites to submit, or abandon their city for want of water; as there is no fountain on the island.

An excellent drawing of the cathedral, or great church of Tortosa, may be seen in "Fisher's Views," and it is abundantly described by many modern travellers. It is the best specimen of its kind in Syria. Very solemn in its loneliness, very filthy and very full of fleas. I copied an Arabic inscription from a stone above the pulpit, from which it appears that one Muhammed es-Sultan purified this church and made it a mosque, in the year of the Hejira 655, about 600 years ago. This must have been after the expulsion of the Crusaders, for the Moslems conquered Tortosa about the middle of the seventh century of our chronology. There was formerly another Arabic inscription legible, commemorating a second purification in the year 782 by Fuary el-Halaby. Who this Aleppo gentleman may have been, tradition says not, and this only record of his only historic act will soon crumble to dust. I suppose this superb edifice is a relict of the prosperous days of the church, under the emperors of Constantinople.

Tortosa was taken by Godfrey in 1099. It was again in the hands of the Moslems in the twelfth century, and Saladin rebuilt and fortified it. In 1367 it was sacked and burnt by the king of Cyprus, assisted by the knights of St. John, and it has had many other sacks and sieges both ancient and modern. I love to linger about its sturdy old ruins, gray with age, and rich in legendary lore. Take a specimen. The governor showed me a low door beneath the centre tower

of the castle, opening upon a passage, which, he said, led to a deep dungeon. In this dismal hole the crusaders confined Melek et-Dâher, bound on an iron saddle; a very uneasy seat for this king Dâher. At length one of his friends, named Shîkâ, tunneled his way beneath the tower, and up to the dungeon, and released his majesty from his uncomfortable saddle. What further exploits they did, do not illustrate this locality, and need not be told. Another door communicated with a secret passage which led up the centre of the enormous butress, to the top of the tower; and similar dark passages, without number, ran all over and under, like mole tracks in a cornfield; and divers strange adventures did happen in them. But of this enough. Here is another scene—a live one—caught in the very acting of it. This curious little city is full of cattle, I mean during the night. This morning, after the flocks and herds were driven out, an alarm ran through the town that the Ansairiyeh had made a descent from the hills and were driving off the cattle—a regular raid or foray this, of the "Border" fashion—a beetle in a bee-hive. What a buz! Away scampered some 15 horsemen, with 80 or 100 footmen *of all arms* at their heels, yelling and shouting like mad men. In about an hour they came back with two of the thieves, and all the cattle. I went with the crowd to the palace, to witness proceedings; and verily two more sinister looking sinners than these Ansairiyeh Borderers, I have not seen. Perhaps Scott would have discovered romance, or even poetry in them, but to my grosser vision they did look like two most shaggy, most unpoetic villains. Let them eat plenty of stick—as a bystander termed the bastinado—a very undignified, unromantic, and rather indigestible breakfast.

Ruad or Arvad.

I was rowed from Tortosa to Ruad in one hour, the distance about three miles, south-west. Most modern travellers represent this little island as covered with ruins, and nearly deserted. In reality it is covered, all except a small space on the east side, with heavy Saracenic and Turkish castles, within which resides a maritime population of about 2000 souls. The shape of this celebrated island is an irregular oval, longest from east to west, and is only 1500 paces in circuit. On the very margin of the sea there are the remains of double Phenician walls, of huge beveled stones, which remind one of the outer foundations at Baalbek. In one part this wall is still 30 or 40 feet high, and was originally 15 or 20 feet thick. This must have been a stronger place than Tyre, for its distance from the shore, and depth

of channel, rendered it impossible for even an Alexander to destroy its insular character. The harbor was on the north-east side, formed by carrying out into the sea, two walls of great stones, to move any one of which, would puzzle our best modern engineers. The space thus protected was divided into two, by a similar wall in the middle. The harbor opens towards Tortosa. The whole island is perforated to the depth of 30 feet with very ancient cisterns. There are said to be 300, and some of them are still used to collect the rain water from the houses.

Ruad, the ancient Arvad, is frequently mentioned in the Bible, and also by ancient historians, who represent it as being a very strong place. The inhabitants were celebrated navigators in those olden times. Its long story, however, of 3000 or 4000 years, is irrecoverably lost—all that is known might be written on a single page. *Sic transit gloria mundi!*

That there were real live Phenicians, full grown men in their day, at Arvad, these huge old walls do testify. The Greeks have left witnesses of their presence graven on columns of hard black basalt—a most scribbling generation.

First Column.

ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΑΔΟΥ
ΙΕΡΕΑΚΑΙΣΑΡΟΣΣΕΒΑΣΤ$_{o}$Υ
ΩΡΟΒΟΥΛΟΝΤΩΝΝΑΥΩ . . . ΙΙ
ΣΑΝΤΩΝΑΟΥΝΟΣΥ – –

Second Column.

ΟΔΗΜΟϹ
ΔЄΚΜΟΝΑΔΙΑΙΟΝ
?
ΛЄΚΜΟΥΥΙΟΝ
ЄΠΑΡΧΟΝϹΤΟΛΟ
ЄΥΝΟΙΥЄЄΝЄΚЄΝ

Third Column.

ω υ V
Κ Ο μ ll Ο Ω Ο
Η Π Α Ι Ο

Fourth Column.

ΗΒΟΥΛΗΚΑΙΟΔΗΜΟΣ
ΑΡΑΔΙΩΝΔΑΜΙΝΜΝΑΣΕΟΥ
?
ΛΓΟΡΑΝΟΜΗΣΑΝΤΑΚΑΛΩΣ
ΚΑΙΦΙΛΟΤΕΙ – ΜΩΣΕΝΤΩΖΟΥ
ΕΤΕΙΤΙΜΗΣΚΑΙΕΥΝΟΙΑΣ
ΧΑΡΙΝ

Fifth Column.

ΗΒΟΥΛΗΙΚΑΙΟ
ΔΗΜΟΣ
ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΝΔΗΜΟΡΡΥ
ΤΟΥΤΟΥΚΑΥΜΑΡΙΩΙ
ΝΟΣΚΑΛΩΣΓΡΑΜΜ
ΤΕΥΣΑΤΩ?
?ΤΩΣΟΤΕΙ
ΤΕΙΜΗΣΧΑΡΙΝ

First Square Block of Black Trap Rock.

. . . . . ΙΗΒΟΥΛΑΙ]
. . . . . ΙΝΙΟΝΣΕΚΟΥΝ
. . . . . ΧΟΝΣΠΕΙΡΗΣΟΡΑ
. ΩΤΗΣΕΠΑΡΧΟΝΝΘ. . . .
ΙΝΑΝΤΓΠΙΤΡΟ. . . . . .
ΥΙΟΥΛΙΟΥΑΛΞ
ΑΡΧΟΥΙΟΥΙΟΥΔΑΙ
ΡΟΠΟΝΣΥΡ
ΩΙΛΕΓΕΩΝΟΣΕ

Second Square Block.

ΗΒL. . . . . .
ΟΔΗ. . . . . .
ΜΑΡΚΟΝ. .]ΤΙΜΙΟΝ
ΜΑΡΟΥΤΙΟΝΦΑΒΙΑ
ΜΑΓΝΟΝΕΚΑΤΟΤΑΡΧΗΝ
ΛΙΓΕΟΝΟ(ΔΕΚΥΟΙΝΗ(
ΤΟΝΕΑΥΤuΝΩΟΛΙΤΗΝ
ΕΥΝΟΙΑΚΑΙΤΙΜΗC ΧΑΡΙΝ.

Trap rock is not found in place on the island, and therefore these columns and blocks have been brought from the Ansairiyeh hills on the main land. With a farewell *ΧΑΡΙΝ* to *ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΟΣ* and *ΔΗΜΟC*, the doctor and *demark* of old Aradus, we row back to Tortosa.

Oct. 29th. We have spent several days about these interesting localities and now start for the great castle of Markûb. Issuing from the gate, the road lies alone the sea-shore. If I had not examined them at my leisure I would turn to the right a little, to look at some very ancient sepulchres cut in the rock above the road. The Mîneh Tortosa, or harbor of the city, is a small, shallow basin about a mile north of the gate. It is protected from the western waves by a wall carried along a natural ledge of rocks which extends about 300 feet into

the sea northward, where the shore makes a sharp detour inland. The extreme north point of this ledge is covered with granite columns, remnants of a splendid custom-house I suppose. The entrance into the harbor is from the north, under a strong vaulted room, where there was once a gate. None but small vessels ever entered this harbor. The water is about seven feet deep near the vaulted room. The anchorage for ships is at Ruad, and only coasting boats take refuge in this Mîneh.

Half a mile north, is a wady called 'Aiyûn, in which are several fountains—one named Harûn. In the sea a few rods from the shore an immense fountain called Ain Ibrahim (Abraham's fountain) boils up from the bottom. In calm weather the boatmen of Ruad still draw fresh water from this fountain. Probably this gave rise to the ancient story that the Arvadites drew their water from a sub-marine fountain between the main land and their island. About a mile further north are extensive ruins called by the Arab peasants Carnoon —the site, doubtless, of the Karnos or Caranus of the ancients.[1] The people from Arvad still quarry stone from these ruins, and below it on the north is a small harbor which appears to have been fortified like that at Tortosa.

From Tortosa to the castle of Markûb is six hours and a half. Passed the following places in order: Nahr Husein, one hour and ten minutes; Ayn et-Tîny, ten minutes; Kirbet Nasif, below which are ruins on the sea-shore, twenty-five minutes; to Tel Busireh, thirty minutes; to Zemreh,[2] the ruined site of an ancient town, twenty minutes. A large village, on the hill, of the same name, is the capital of the district called Zimreen. To Nahr Markea, thirty-five minutes. One hour and ten minutes further to Ain el-Frary; about half an hour further is Nahr Bos, near which we left the coast and turned up the mountain to the castle.

Benjamin of Tudela says this Markûb is Kedemoth in the land of Sichem! The castle covers the entire summit of the high trap mount upon which it is built—perhaps 1000 feet high—triangular at top—sides nearly perpendicular, except on the south where it joins on to the general range of mountains by a narrow and low neck. Here is a deep ditch and an immense round tower, some seventy feet high, wall sixteen feet thick, of hard black basalt. Here are vaults and magazines enough to hold half the grain of Syria, and cisterns and stables,

[1] This name and site are here for the first time identified.—EDS.

[2] Not the seat of the *Zemarites*, Gen. 10: 18. That was probably the *Simyra* mentioned by Pliny and others near the river Eleutherus; Cellar. Not. Orb. II. p. 375.—EDS.

etc. to any amount required. Outside the castle, on the "neck," is a very large cistern to which water was formerly brought from the eastern mountain, and below it are ruined baths. The wall of this castle is carried round the brow of the hill, and wherever there was need of it, a ditch was dug in the solid trap rock. This is the largest and naturally strongest fortification I have seen; 2000 families might find accommodation in it, and a thousand horses stand in its stables. When in complete repair, and the draw bridge (on the west side) up, I do not see how it could be entered. It was, however, captured by the crusaders, and then retaken by the sultan of Egypt in 1282–3. It then belonged to the Hospitalers who made a protracted and desperate defence. The walls, however, were undermined and thrown down; and after dreadful slaughter on both sides the standard of the Prophet floated proudly from the great tower. So says Abu el-Fida, who assisted at the seige, being a lad of but twelve years. There is a fine church in the tower at the south angle of the castle—now a mosque. History ecclesiastic reports that the bishops of Balanea, at the base of this mount on the north, were obliged to retire to this castle during the troublous times of the age mediaeval, and this was probably their cathedral.

The face of the mountain down to the sea presents a most extraordinary appearance. It is trap rock of a bright iron rust color, and drawn and tossed about in a wonderful manner.

The district of Markûb has eighty-seven villages. The governor's name is Achmet Aga es-Swaidan of the Beit Adra, an ancient but dilapidated family. A branch of this family governs in Zemry or Zemreen, a sub-district south of Markûb. And another branch govern the district of Khowaly, further south and east. It has fifty-six villages. This family is Moslem—the people mostly Ansairiyeh. East of these is the large district of Kudmûs with 177 villages. The rulers are Ismailiyeh and reside in the celebrated castle of Kudmûs. They are of the Hejawieh and Swaidonea families and are called Emeers. The next district northward is Sumt Kubleh with seventy-one villages, divided into three sub-districts, governed by the Beit Mutrad, Beit Athman and Beit Abu Asy. They are Ansairiyeh and their title is Mekuddam. The fifth district is Biny Aly, forty-two villages. The name of the governing family is Abu Sheleh, residence at Ain es-Shukâk. They are all Ansairiyeh. Sixth district is Kurdaheh with seventy-seven villages—has so many sub-districts, and petty rulers, with hard names, that we will not attempt them. Above these two last named districts is a long tract of mountain covered with ruins, and abounding in fountains but now entirely deserted. This is

worth exploring. Seventh district is Mehabebeh with forty-seven villages, whose sheikhs of the Beit Ghusn live in el-Leddiyeh. Eighth district is el-Mezeirâh, divided into mountain and plain with sheikhs of various names and residences. There are 113 villages of which more than one half belong to the plain. Ninth district is Suhiyûn having forty-seven villages. In this district is the great castle Sahiyûn, now deserted. The sheikhs are Moslems of several different families, with the title of Jenad. The inhabitants mostly Ansairiyeh as in all the other districts. Tenth district, Sahil Ladakîyeh with fifty-eight villages. Eleventh district is Bahlûlîyeh—44 villages—cursed with a host of sheikhs. Twelfth district, Jeble Krâd —117 villages broken into five sub-districts, each with its family of Moslem sheikhs called Agas. Thirteenth district, el-Baîyer—small, and my list of villages imperfect—have only twelve names. It is north-east of Ladakîyeh. Fourteenth district is Bujâk with 175 villages. Their rulers are Moslem Agas of Beit Tubukmâ of el-Kshîsh and Beit 'Arbony of Dally Kurrally. This is the extreme north district belonging to the government of Ladakîyeh. Besides these 1123 villages there are many small farming establishments called cheflîks, not mentioned, and the list of Baiyer is imperfect. There may be, therefore, some 1200 villages under the governor of Ladakîa. The consul of Ladakîa estimates the number of inhabitants as follows: Ansairiyeh, 70,000; Moslems, 25,000; Christians, 6,000, mostly Greeks; Ismailiyeh, 2,000 or 3,000, residing only at Kudmûs. This estimate accords well with the results of the government lists of Tripoli, where the number of inhabitants of each village was taken by Ibrahim Pasha. The average number of inhabitants to a village, according to these lists, is 104. The entire population in the province of Ladakîa, including wandering Arabs and Kurds, may therefore be set down at 120,000. This province is very extensive, and naturally fertile, but the people are poor and ignorant and degraded, far below the general level of Syrian population. The mountains and hills are generally trap rock, or marl and limestone, dislocated and tossed about in a wonderful manner by the obtrusion of trap dykes. The plains of Jebilee and Ladakîa are mostly argilaceous and cretaceous marls. The mountain districts abound in ruined castles, some of them ancient, and bearing Jewish names—as Musa, Daood, Solyman, Sahiyûn (Sion), etc., and the tradition is, that they were built by the Jews. These mountains will probably well reward the traveller who may have time to explore them. This examination should be undertaken with some precaution against robbery and worse, for those more than half savage mountaineers are not to be trusted.

With these general remarks about the region through which we are travelling, we shall pursue our journey.

Oct. 30th. The descent from Markûb to the sea at Banias (Balinas and Balanea of the ancients) took one hour and ten minutes. This city was pleasantly situated, facing the sea northward, and having the river of Banias on the south and west. The foundations of a handsome church are still visible, and extensive Roman ruins cover the plain, for a considerable distance. Near the sea are many granite columns, marking the site of some public edifice—a temple, or a custom-house, perhaps. To the east, on a low hill, are what appear to be the remains of the ancient acropolis, or strong hold. This city has an ecclesiastical history, and is also mentioned by the crusaders. It is now utterly deserted. There are only two or three large vaulted rooms on the shore, used for salt depôts, and a mill on the south of the city.

From Banias to N. Jobar, one hour; a broken bridge, and above the road some ruins, of Roman brick. To N. Husseîn, twenty minutes; another broken bridge, and in the plain to the east, large and very old buildings. To N. es-Sin, forty-five minutes. The ruins at the mouth of this river, are now called Baldeh—the Greek Paltos. There are many granite columns on both sides of the river. Some parts of old castles made out of more ancient ruins—stones with Phenician bevel—granite columns, and Roman cut stones built together. The river is never fordable, the banks being marshy and the water eight or ten feet deep, with a stiff current. On the north of the bridge stands the only building now found at this site, called Tâhoon Baldeh (Mill of Paltos), designed probably as a guard house to command the bridge. A little to the north of this, was the ancient harbor, once artificially protected—and a ditch from this to the river eastward made the part where the Tahoon stands an island. The plain for a mile or two north of the harbor is covered with remains of ancient buildings. But the river itself has probably a historic interest greater than the city. I suppose it marks the territory of, and derives its name *Sin* from the ancient Sinites, mentioned in the Bible (Gen. 10: 17 and 1 Chron. 1: 15) along with the Arkite, Arvadite, Zemarite, etc., all which names have come down to us (as seen in this journal) attached to their original localities.[1] I suspect that the Phenician ruins wrought into the castle of Paltos belonged to a city bearing the name of the grandson of Ham—lost in the Greek word Paltos—the name of the

[1] The *Sinites* mentioned with the Arkites, are more probably to be sought for near Arka and Lebanon. Jerome speaks of a place *Sini* not far from Arka; and Strabo also mentions here a city *Sinni*. Gesen. Lex. art. סִינִי.—Eds.

tribe was transferred to the river, and has thus been preserved down to our day. I have a suspicion that the twenty-four clans of these strange Ansairiyeh who inhabit the wild mountains from Arka to Jebilee are the remnants of the old Arkites, Arvadites, Zimrites, Sinites and Jiblites. They themselves declare that they have always lived there from *kuddeem es zeman*, which means 'before antiquity began,' I suppose. They are a very strange people, and sufficiently under the curse of Canaan to be his lineal descendants.

This river is also sometimes called N. el-Milk, from a tribe of stationary Arabs with this name, encamped on its banks. The water is beautifully clear at all seasons; nor does it greatly increase or diminish through the year. It is said to take its rise in an immense fountain a few miles up in the plain—more likely it is the drainage of a large marsh which I also heard mentioned—or it may be the joint contribution of many fountains which are likewise said to abound in the eastern hills. Fron N. es-Sin to N. el-Moileh is twenty-five minutes, thence to N. Sucas is fifteen minutes, where is a very large mound on the north of a pretty little bay. Hereabouts existed a large city sometime "before antiquity began." The ruins are extensive. From Sucas to N. Jebilee or, as the natives call it, Ibn Bûrgûl, is thirty-five minutes; and half an hour more to the town of Jebilee. Most of this day's ride has been through a very fertile plain.

Jebilee or Gebilee.

Benjamin of Tudela calls this Baal Gad under Lebanon! Whatever it may have been formerly it is now a miserable Moslem town—a patch work of old things and new—a very unsatisfactory place. With rain and rats and fleas, a glorious Arabian night's entertainment had we this 30th of October, 1845. We got into the bath and amused ourselves with a midnight scouring. This bath belongs to Sultan Ibrahim, as does everything else in this place, the rats and the fleas and the roguish dervishes who preside over the whole. We went in, to have a night view of the grave of this great saint. The room is much the same as when Maundrell peeped into it in 1696, except that there are now about 200 silver lamps suspended from the roof. We listened to the same stories of Sultan Ibrahim—"especially touching his mortificatiou, and renouncing the world," etc. with which that celebrated traveller was entertained—got small bits of sacred wax from the candles at the grave, paid a *buksheesh*, walked about a good deal, slept a little, and watched for the morning. It did come at last, this 31st of October, bright, clear, and sweet after the rain, and we walked

out in very good humor to look at the lions "and other savages" of Jebilee. And first the theatre. This majestic old Roman edifice will probably continue to stand thousands of years, dimly shadowing forth the wealth, magnificence and gaiety of the good people of Jebilee in days of yore. It is a semicircle whose radius is 150 feet, outer circumference 450 feet, which agrees well with my measurement, although I could not complete the measurement on account of some huts erected against the wall. The portico, the orchestra, the scene, etc. are all gone, but the *cavea* is nearly perfect with its concentric ranks of seats divided by their *praecinctiones*, *cunei*, etc. quite distinguishable. Beneath the seats are the dens for lions and beasts of savage name. They are very spacious, and in good preservation. Several parts of the *cavea* are occupied by mean Arab huts, and the place of the *scena* is a sheepfold for half the town. All the columns and other architectural ornaments have been carried off.

Jebilee has a small harbor, once defended at the entrance by very many piers, the stones eleven feet long by six wide. Above these stood a temple I suppose. More than forty granite columns have tumbled into the sea. The rock in place is petrified coral, the only example of the kind I have found on the coast of Syria.

Started for Ladakîa about seven o'clock, having around us a crowd of the daily pensioners upon the bounty of sultan Ibrahim—assembled for their breakfast—a noisy, filthy, lazy rabble. Such an institution as this, is a nurse of idleness, pauperism and vice, especially in a country like Syria, where the climate, the religion, and the habits of the people tend to create a recklessness of the future, and a disgust of steady industry. Nor is there any necessity. Whoever will work has a wide field and plenty of unoccupied land before him.

From Jebilee to Ladakîa is a ride of five or six hours—the distance not far from twenty miles—a desert without a village. In half an hour is Nahr Rumeileh. In another hour N. er-Roos, where is a broken bridge, and below it a very large artificial mound covered with the rubbish of a very ancient town. It was once fortified with a wall, and a ditch at least 100 feet wide. The circumference is somewhat more than a mile, and the present elevation may be fifty feet. We rode to the next river in fifty-nine minutes—called Mudîyuke. It once had a bridge; the banks are marshy, and it is celebrated as the scene of many robberies. To N. Snubar is thirty minutes. This river has forsaken its former channel—a good bridge now stands useless over the original bed of the stream. From this to N. Kebeer is a good hour, and the same distance thence to Ladakîa. The bridge over N. Kebeer was broken down last winter, and travellers find much

difficulty in crossing during the rainy reason. The whole route from Jebilee to Ladakîa is over a level plain, with the sea at no great distance to the left.

Ladakîa was built, or at least repaired, enlarged, and named by Seleucus Nicator. I obtained a large silver coin, with his name on it. There are many traces of Phenician work about this place, and the superiority of its harbor over all others on the Syrian coast, for purposes of ancient shipping, must have caused a city to spring up around it in the remotest times. The name and history of the original city, have perished together ;—not so the tombs of its inhabitants. These are found on the north and west of the present town—rooms, crypts, and sarcophagi—almost without number hewn in the solid rock, of all shapes and sizes, from the small baby nich eighteen inches long, to spacious apartments with side niches long enough and large enough for the last repose of a whole generation of Anakims. A peep into one will give an idea of the rest. A descending passage twenty-two feet long, cut down through the solid rock, conducts you by eleven good steps to a low door, and into a room 19½ feet square. Each side of this room has four large niches dug into the rock at right angles to the side, and each capable of containing two bodies. The height of the vault is six feet, but the rooms are partially filled with the accumulated rubbish of ages. No bones are found in any of them. They were empty relics of antiquity during the first century of the Christian era ; and how much earlier I know not. Their prodigious number, and the great expense of making them, speak with certainty of a numerous and wealthy people. These sepulchres resemble those found in the neighborhood of Jerusalem, and in many places along the Phenician coast. One of the largest is called Mar Tukleh ; and there is a tradition that this celebrated young lady and saint, in one of her flights, concealed herself in this tomb, where she received the visits of the devout, and united with them in their secret worship. There is a well of water in this tomb, and on the festival of her ladyship, prayers and masses are performed there with great solemnity. It is nothing strange that the primitive Christians assembled in such tombs as these for worship when persecution raged. They are large, dry, and hidden from view.

The harbor is at the extreme west point of the cape or headland of Ladakîa. It is a circular basin of water capable of containing some twenty brigs and other small craft, and might be greatly enlarged. It was protected by a wall on the sea-side, and the narrow entrance is commanded by a strong tower. Granite columns have been plentifully used in constructing these defences, which proves them to be,

not the work of the original inhabitants of the place, but probably Roman. I need not speak of the city itself, of the columns found in many places, nor of the triumphal arch. These things are described by all travellers.

Ladakîa, with a Greek population of not more than 1000, has five Greek churches, an Armenian church with but one worshipper, and a Latin chapel with a few Catholic families. The Moslems number 4000, and have many handsome mosques. The Christians of all sects are pleasant and sociable, and the wealthier families have a strong leaning to Frank habits. Ladakîa has now but little trade. Not half the magazines at the Mîneh are used; the remainder are gradually falling to ruin. Nor do I see reason to expect that this process of decay will be arrested. Scandaroon has diverted the Aleppo trade, and the surrounding country is becoming more and more impoverished and depopulated. Tobacco is the main article of export, and that is falling off. The following table of the yearly exports was given me by the British consular agent, himself a principal merchant.

Tobacco,	2500	Cantars,	valued at about		2,050,000	Piasters.
Silk,	20	"	"	"	1,500,000	"
Cotton,	400	"	"	"	320,000	"
Simsum,	1500	"	"	"	360,000	"
Wheat,	3000	Shimbuls,	"	"	600,000	"
Barley,	1500	"	"	"	150,000	"
Indian Corn,	300	"	"	"	30,000	"
Oil,	800	Cantars,	"	"	240,000	"
Honey,	20	"	"	"	60,000	"
Butter,	100	"	"	"	120,000	"
Wool,	30	"	"	"	25,000	"
Beeswax,	20	"	"	"	60,000	"

Nov. 3rd. Started for Aleppo, and rode 5½ hours to Bahlulîah, the head of the district of the same name. At the end of the first hour, passed a small village called Skûbîn, from which to Jendîyeh is an hour and a half. Thence to the ford of Nahr Kebèer one hour, near Damat. The next village is Restîn, from whence to Bahlulîyeh is half an hour. The road led over white marl plains and low hills, through which bluish green serpentine occasionally obtrudes. There are also localities of jasper and silicious shale. As we approach Bahlulîah the rock is limestone; and below the village are large beds of gypsum of the kind called selenite; the crystals are large, pure and transparent as glass. In the bed of N. Kebeer, along whose banks we rode for an hour, is an infinite quantity of trap boulders in rich variety, porous lava, vesicular, amygdaloid, globular basalt, compact greenstone, etc.; also geodes of each, spar chalcedony, quartz-chert, and

often all combined in a single specimen. The marl abounds in fossils extremely well preserved.

It is melancholy to ride a day through such a lovely country, without meeting a human being, or coming to a tree large enough to shelter one from the burning sun. I asked the sheikh of Bahlulîah why they did not plant orchards, cultivate their fields, and multiply their flocks on these beautiful hills. "Why should I plant a tree? said he; I shall not be allowed to eat the fruit of it. If I repair my old house, or build a new one, heavier exactions will surely fall upon me. To enlarge my fields, or increase my flock, would have the same effect. We grow only so much grain as we can conceal in wells and cisterns. How much tax we are to pay, and when a fresh demand is to be made, we never know. You see my village full of horsemen quartered upon us; it is always so. To-day it is, Give money; to-morrow it is barley; next day wheat; then tobacco, or butter, or honey, or—Allah knows what. Then some one has been robbed, somewhere or other, yesterday or some other day, or never, by some body or no body—it matters not—the horsemen come, and take whatever they can get. Now we have nothing left, they beat us, our wives and our children. Some of the people flee, the rest of us have horsemen quartered upon us until we bring back the runaways. Some, driven to desperation, really turn robbers in the wild *jurd*, which again adds to our sufferings. Why should we work for such a government? The curse of Allah rest upon their fathers! We can bear this no longer. In reality many are fleeing north to the plains of Adona, and the mountains of Sinjar."

At Bahlulîah I was taken sick; and as the fever did not yield to what medical skill we had at command, I was obliged to abandon the journey to Aleppo for the present. We returned to Ladakîa, and from thence by sea to Beirût. Subsequently I completed the tour to Aleppo and returned through the country by Jeble el-Aala, el-Baru, Apamea, Ribla, Humel, Baalbek, to Abieh in Lebanon. This was an interesting and somewhat untrodden route, which will be described in a future article. And if time and health permit, I may prepare a paper on the Ansairiyeh, Ismailiyeh, and other tribes which inhabit these districts, from materials collected during these tours.

ARTICLE III.

DE WETTE'S COMMENTARY ON ROMANS 5: 12—19.

Translated by M. Stuart, Professor at Andover.

Introductory Remarks.

[It may be proper to state some reasons, why a portion of Commentary by De Wette on Rom. 5: 12—19 has been translated, and is here inserted.

Every one conversant with theology or exegesis knows what importance has been attached to the passage of Scripture in question. It is appealed to beyond all others, as peculiarly exhibiting the condition of fallen man, and the connection of his depravity and guilt with the fall of the first human pair. The doctrine of *original sin*, or (as the Germans call it) *inherited sin* (Erbsünde), has been regarded, by a large portion of evangelical theologians, as having its most ample and solid basis in the passage before us. Of course, their opponents have made every possible effort to show, that the passage has been misunderstood and misinterpreted by them. The contest has been going on, in respect to this subject, ever since the days of Augustine and Pelagius, and even from a period still more remote. It would form a library of no small extent, were all that has been written on this subject embodied and published. Nor can we well wonder at this. The subject is one of the deepest interest. Men of sober thought and reflection will be prone to ask: What is our present native condition as moral and accountable beings? If corrupt and depraved, how has this been brought about, inasmuch as we naturally expect everything which comes from the hands of the Creator to be good? Can sin, or a sinful state or condition, be propagated? How far are we accountable for a state or condition, which we did not contribute in any way originally to form or introduce? How far are we, or can we reasonably be, accountable for the acts of others? These and many more of the like questions must give a high degree of interest to Rom. 5: 12—19; for it is here, either directly or consequentially, that material is found by the mass of theologians who are of the stricter cast, for the solution of such questions. Hence the animated attacks upon what is called the orthodox exposition of this passage, and the equally animated defences of that exposition.

Of late, some distinguished critics and theologians in Germany have renewed, in an animated way, the discussion of these matters. Pamphlets, monogramms, small volumes, *excursus* appended to commentaries, etc., have been issued almost every year, until, as one would naturally suppose, the subject has been presented in nearly every possible light. In circumstances such as these, and after all the improvements made in sacred philology, it seems desirable that the theologian and the interpreter among us should have access to some abridged and summary view of what has been achieved by discussion; and such an one is presented in the pages of De Wette, a translation of which follows the present remarks.

What has just been stated is the leading reason for publishing the exegesis of De Wette. But there are other reasons, at which we will merely glance.

No living writer in the province of theology, sacred archaeology, and Hebrew and Greek philology and exegesis, can lay claim to more distinction in regard to extent and accuracy of knowledge acquired by study, than De Wette, though in particular departments men of greater ability may be found. It is a matter of the most unfeigned regret, on the part of all who are acquainted with his writings, and are at the same time the friends of evangelical sentiment, that his critical views are mostly of the *neological* cast, and his theological ones, in many respects, deeply tinged with the philosophy of the day. Still he is different, in not a few important particulars, from most of the distinguished writers of the neological school. He never rails. He employs no sarcasm or bitterness. He does not purposely misrepresent the views of those from whom he differs. He never exhibits levity, or indifference to religion. In *feeling*, he is understood and extensively believed to be nearer to the orthodox party than to the other. Those of evangelical sentiment, at least many of them who are acquainted with De Wette, even regard him as cherishing substantially the views and feelings of a Christian. His *head*, they say, has been turned by speculative philosophy, and is not in a right position, but his *heart* beats truly, at least it often does so, and responds to the hearts of others who love and believe the truth.

One thing, at least, can be truly said of De Wette as a commentator, especially as he appears in his latest works of interpretation. This is, that he rarely introduces anything but the simple principles of exegesis and philology, in order to establish his views of the meaning of Scripture. All creeds and confessions are left out of sight, and the text, and context, and tenor of discourse, and peculiarities of idiom, and matters of antiquity that have respect to various objects and opin-

ions and circumstances, are ever resorted to as the only reliable guides on which an interpreter can depend. Impartially, for the most part, has he dealt with all these exegetical subsidiaries. And that he brings to the decision of any exegetical question, a rare skill in detecting the nicer shades of language, a highly cultivated aesthetical feeling, and great discrimination in judging of the real and logical course of thought, no intelligent reader of him can deny or even doubt.

In one respect De Wette has some advantage over those who come to the investigation of Scripture with all their opinions formed and settled beforehand. The latter are often found in the attitude of pugnacious reasoners, now explaining away this, then introducing that, just as they wish to defend or to build up their own doctrinal structure. The paramount authority of the Scriptures they acknowledge, and hence the strenuous effort to make them speak what they themselves believe. De Wette is apparently free from any strong bias in this way. He is virtually a serious, sober Naturalist, (if I may so characterize him). He believes in the divine origin and authority of the Scriptures in the same sense in which he believes in the divine origin of all that is rational and moral in man, and of all that is good and beautiful in the world of nature around us. He regards the scriptural writers as well meaning, honest, sincere men, with the best intentions and most laudable purposes in view. But he also regards them as liable to mistakes, both as to matters of fact and of doctrine. He moreover believes them to have been too credulous, and thinks that they were somewhat tinctured with the superstitions of their age and country. Of course he attributes no *binding* authority to their decisions; and he is, in this way, placed as it were in a state of indifference, whether this or that statement or sentiment of the scriptural writers is correct or erroneous. So it comes about, almost as a matter of course, that he has no strong bias toward finding in the Scriptures this or that particular sentiment. We may easily conceive, that a scholar, in such a position, might investigate the Bible simply in a philological way, without any serious concern what the result of his investigation may turn out to be.

The translator of the following piece is very far from believing such a state of mind to be, on the whole, the most promising as to the real discovery of moral and religious truth. But he must think, that to such a man there is comparatively little embarrassment, in the way of striving to obtain the simple results of philology.

Of all the essays which the translator has read on Rom. 5: 12—19, he knows of none which have carried out simple hermeneutical principles in exegesis so entirely and exclusively as De Wette. This is

another reason for presenting the translation that follows. It cannot fail to be a matter of interest to all earnest inquirers, to know what are the fair results of such a process as De Wette has instituted. This process, from the hand of such a critic as he, deserves, and should elicit, the serious study of all who wish to arrive at the conclusions to which a purely philological discussion will lead them.

There is another consideration of some importance to many of the readers of the Bibliotheca Sacra. De Wette has nearly finished an *Exegetical Manual*, i. e. a brief synoptical interpretation, of the whole New Testament. His work, although not yet extensively known and used among us, will doubtless, ere long, be in the hands of many readers. Those who have had no opportunity to consult it, so as to know the manner and value of it, may learn, from the specimen now to be submitted to them, what they have to expect from the writer in question.

It is easy to see, that a commentary on the plan of De Wette must be exceedingly compressed and terse. Single words are made to speak whole sentences; single sentences, a whole paragraph. Hence the difficulty of reading and understanding De Wette's critical notes. Indeed, it must be rare, that the beginner in exegesis can be able to take in and fully understand the whole course of thought. De Wette supposes his readers to be already familiarly acquainted with all or most of the best critical works, including commentaries, literary introductions, and monogramms on particular passages. Hence he adverts to such works by a single word, or short sentence, leaving the reader to fill out what is lacking by his own knowledge. His abridgments of words, almost without number, are also very embarrassing to the unexperienced reader. So far as it regards *proper names*, this difficulty is mostly obviated in the following pages, by fully writing out the names which might occasion difficulty to many or most readers in our country. Beyond this the translator has not thought it best to go, because it is a part of his design to present De Wette as he is—terse, compressed, not to say abrupt, nearly beyond example.

The translator does not pledge himself as having in every case presented the exact shades of De Wette's meaning; for in fact he is almost *un*translatable. Another language must fail to hit off some of the light and shade of his German sketches. But the aim has been, to be as nearly literal as the matter would bear, so far as our language would furnish the means. This is purposely done with the design of presenting De Wette as he is, or at least of coming as near to an exact likeness as may be.

The question is frequently asked: Why not present the whole of De Wette's Commentary in an English translation? An answer to

this may perhaps be found, in the specimen of it now to be subjoined. If not, then I would say, (1) Because our public are not prepared to receive and profit by it. His circle of references is mainly beyond our circle of reading and knowledge. His work makes demands on the reader, which most readers among us are not prepared to meet. Of course, much of his book would remain unintelligible, and therefore unprofitable. His trees are planted in a foreign soil and climate, and they will not bear transplanting without either stinting their growth, or rendering them fruitless. (2) Because the general tendency of his work leads on to mere Rationalism, and to a denial of the divine authority, consistency, and excellence of the Scriptures.

If the reader of the following exegesis expects to be interested in it, or to profit by it, he must do this by dint of real study, not of cursory perusal. A page or two will satisfy him of this. But if he will submit to patient labor and study, and has the power of appreciating what the author has done, he will find that there is scarcely a question of importance in respect to philology, that is not brought under examination. Various readings, points of grammar, matters of idiom, connection of thought, relation of parts to each other and to the whole, different opinions of respectable critics, different doctrinal views—in a word, everything which can fairly come within the compass of interpretation, is touched upon by De Wette, and his opinion, with the reasons for it, is summarily expressed. So much is crowded into a compass so small, that it can be duly understood and appreciated only by severe and intelligent effort.

Both parties in the contest among us about *original sin*, will be surprised, it is probable, at the results which De Wette presents. Those who contend for the views of the Westminster Catechism, would little expect from such latitudinarianism as that of De Wette, a result which differs only in some minor respects from their own. Those who are opposed to such views, will be disappointed at finding De Wette approach so near to the other party; inasmuch as they naturally, and perhaps confidently, expected very different conclusions from such a man. On v. 12 he says: "The apostle teaches the spread of sin, as well as death, among all men, in and through Adam. But the way and manner of this he does not particularly explain." In respect to the *spread of sin*, he also declares, that "in part it comes through the natural and organic propagation of a sinful inclination;" in part "through our social relations and connections;" and, "as the basis of both these, the apostle teaches the native likeness of all men, by virtue of which the sin of Adam becomes the sin of all. Still the sin that is propagated or inherited is finally the free act of all, for

which they are accountable. It is on this ground that he establishes the accountability of all, and the justice of punishment. How near this view comes to that of Pres. Edwards, every discerning reader will easily perceive.

It is no part of the translator's object to canvass, on the present occasion, the right or wrong of De Wette's views, but simply to present them to the reader. De Wette has left out of view the case of infants; and many a theological question that has been raised, he has not considered, because it did not come within his plan. How far philology supports his conclusions in general, the reader will judge for himself. But in whatever way he may decide this question, I think he will be constrained to say, that a more acute, subtile, thorough, philological analysis of the words and sentiments of Rom. 5: 12—19, cannot well be found, among all the essays that have been written upon it. Whether we agree or disagree in the results with the interpreter, we shall at least feel under obligation to him for having done so much to cast light on the simple meaning of the language which Paul has employed, in the development of his views respecting our connection with Adam and with Christ.—M. S.]

Summary of vs. 12—19. While the apostle is bringing into view justification by Christ and its effects which are fraught with blessings, he feels himself impelled to cast a comparative look on the times which had preceded. With Christ begins a new period of life and happiness for men, after death and misery had before his appearance been predominant. Both of these states are in one respect alike, viz. as to the fact that one individual, here Christ and there Adam, stands at the head. *As by one (Adam) sin and death came upon all men, so by one (Christ) justification, life, and happiness, are imparted to all. The difference between them is, that in the one case sin, death, and corruption reigned, while in the other grace in a surpassing measure, life, and happiness, bear sway.*

Comp. Jost, Versuch e. Erklärung von Rom. 5: 12—21, in Schmidt, Bibl. Krit. Exeget. II. 2. Schott, Program. in Ep. ad Rom. 5: 12—14, Opusc. I. Finkh, Neue Erklärung von Rom. 5: 12. Tüb. Zeitsch. 1830, I. Schmid, Bemerkung üb. Rom. 5: 12, ib. IV. Rothe, Neue Versuch einer Ausleg. d. Rom. 5: 12—21. 1836.

(V. 12.) *Διὰ τοῦτο, therefore, accordingly*, stands related to vs. 1—11, which describe the effects of justification by Christ. Rothe refers the relation to the idea comprised in these verses of the altered relation of men to God by reason of their *sanctification*, and supposes this to be the definite point of comparison with the clause *ἐφ᾽ ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον*. That thought, however, is merely accessory, and the lead-

ing idea of the passage is the σωτηρία, and in this is comprised the contrast or opposite of *sin* and *death* in v. 12.

ὥσπερ, a particle which may mark either the first or the second member of a comparison. Most interpreters hold the clause before us to be the first member; but Cocceius, Elsner, Koppe, and a few others, regard it as the second, and they supply the preceding member out of the paragraph that goes before. But in this the points of comparison are not at least explicitly stated; and if we make out the first member by the words τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐλάβομεν δι' αὐτοῦ, one does not well know what he is entering upon by the comparison. Those who take ὥσπερ δι' ἑνὸς κ. τ. λ. to be the *first* member, fall into still greater difficulties; for in this case no second member of the comparison can be pointed out. It cannot be v. 18, making vs. 13—17 a parenthesis, (Grotius, Wetstein, Reiche, Flatt); for the ἄρα οὖν of that verse manifestly points it out as a deduction from the context immediately preceding. Moreover, vs. 13—17 have not the nature of a parenthesis. Vs. 13, 14, do indeed make an interruption of the course of thought; but at the end of v. 14 is a proper period, and v. 15 begins a contrast. Nor can the second member of the comparison be found in the words καὶ οὕτως (i. e. οὕτως καί by inversion, Clericus, Wolfius); for in this way διὰ τοῦτο would be made superfluous, and the comparison with Christ would be superseded. Nor can it be in the words καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος (Erasmus, Beza), whereby in like manner the comparison between Adam and Christ would be left out of view. Nor do the words ὅς ἐστι τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος, in v. 14, constitute the second member (Calvin, Tholuck, Köllner, Meyer); for this clause, being coördinate and comprising a conclusion, by its form involves the idea of a comparison that has been already made. The supposition, that the after-clause was forgotten by the writer (Origen, Bengel, Rückert, Fritzsche, Win. § 64. II. s. 494, Rothe), is to be sure in some measure supported by the digressive nature of vs. 13, 14; but it is not probable that the apostle, v. 15, would bring into view the dissimilarity between Adam and Christ, rather than complete a comparison already begun.

It is an error to suppose that there must be two members of a comparison definitely in mind, if not plainly declared. The first is silently omitted; as if we should say: *Therefore so as*, and then leave it to the reader to make out the whole relation of the comparison from the one member of it which is expressed. Exactly in this way is the comparison managed after ὥσπερ in Matt. 25: 14, and after καθώς in Gal. 3: 6. In the passage before us, Paul thinks of no other point of comparison than this, viz. that through one man a change in the con-

dition of all mankind was introduced. In this respect is Adam a type of Christ. But at the same time, the full comparison rests upon several points of contrast also, which are brought to view in vs. 15—17; and by adding these he prepares the way for a full exhibition at last of similarity and contrast in vs. 18, 19. This arrangement of thought is disturbed by the usual mode of interpretation; for in this, one assumes that the whole second member of the comparison, comprising similarity and dissimilarity, is virtually expressed in v. 12. In this case, the contrast in vs. 15 seq. appears to destroy the comparison; and v. 18, which has the form of a deduction, assumes the nature of an annoying repetition. (Erroneously do Grotius and others hold ἄρα οὖν to be a sign of resumption). The matter may perhaps be made clear, by the following exhibition of the course of thought: '*Therefore does Christ stand in a relation to mankind like to that which Adam bears, by whom sin and death came into the world,*' (v. 12—to διῆλθεν). The additional clause: ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον leads to a digression in vindication of its correctness, which is contained in v. 13, ἄχρι γὰρ νόμου κ. τ. λ, on to v. 14, τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδάμ. With the secondary and associated clause, ὅς ἐστι τύπος κ. τ. λ, the apostle reverts again to the comparison in v. 12.

Since however the entire comparison comprises *contrasts* [as well as similitudes], these are developed in vs. 15—17. They lie in the ideas designated by παράπτωμα and χάρισμα with χάρις, which is regarded as far superior in its effects (v. 15); in κατάκριμα and δικαίωμα; in εἷς ἁμαρτήσας and πολλὰ παραπτώματα (v. 16); and in θάνατος and ζωή with the much greater dominion of the latter (v. 17). With these points of contrast, however, points of similitude are at the same time developed; which are ὁ εἷς [Ἀδάμ] and ὁ εἷς ἄνθρωπος [Χριστός]; also οἱ πολλοί the posterity of Adam, and οἱ πολλοί those who belong to Christ (v. 15); and together with these, the βασιλεύειν of θάνατος, and the βασιλεύειν ἐν ζωῇ (v. 17). It is now, at the close of all this, that the apostle comprises both together, viz. contrasts and similitudes, and fully makes out his simple parallels in vs. 18, 19, as already in thought he had done in v. 12.

Δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθε. The meaning of this clause is to be determined by correctly defining each particular idea. Light is cast upon it by Rom. 7: 7 seq., where a subjective view of the same thing is presented. The word ἁμαρτία is not the mere abstract of actual sin (Reiche, Meyer), in such a way that Paul designates merely the very first period of its rise or origin; but, like v. 21 and 3: 9, it designates sin as a *dominant power*, partly as a principle, such as in accordance with 7: 8 slumbers in every man

and develops itself in its dominant sway over men in general, and partly as a sinful state or condition, such as Paul has described in 1: 17—3: 21. The word does not mean simply *sinfulness*, nor is the idea designated by it exactly *inherited sin* (Calv.), or *the habit of sin* (Olshausen), or *sinful inclination* (Rothe). To admit a personification (Reiche, Fritzsche, and others), such an one as finds place in 7: 8 seq., we have no sufficient ground in the plain expression *εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθε*. This means not merely *began to be, was first committed* (Reiche, Fritzsche, Meyer), i. e. that which before was possible now began its actual existence, without comprising also the idea of extension. This is intimated by the *δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου* which is placed in contrast with *πάντες*, and attaches itself to the idea of *κόσμος*, which is equivalent to mankind, not merely *human nature* (Reiche), or the *moral community*, because sin is something of a moral nature. In the same way is it spoken of in Wisd. 2: 24. 14: 14, and Gal. 3: 23 with simply *ἔρχεσθαι*. Still, the idea of *extension* is afterwards more fully brought to view.

δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου = *διὰ τοῦ παραπτώματος* (*διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς*) *τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου*, vs. 18, 19. *Διά* is here connected with the original cause (v. 19), like the Dat. case in v. 17, only that the latter has respect to action, but the one before us to the agent, and so a distinction is marked between the immediate and mediate cause. (Comp. Matth. Gramm. Graec. § 396, Rothe, p. 112). The *one man* is Adam, not Eve (Pelagius), although Paul in 1 Tim. 2: 14 names the latter as being first led away (comp. 2 Cor. 11: 3), because, in reference to the *world* (the mass of men) the woman disappears behind the man, and not because the sin of Adam was peculiar and inexcusable, while that of Eve was excusable (Fritzsche).

καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος, i. e. *θάνατος εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθε*, namely in consequence of the divine sentence of condemnation, Gen. 2: 17. 3: 19. It is not therefore mere spiritual death, but *corporeal* which is meant (Chrys., Aug., Calov., and others, Reiche, Meyer, Fritzsche). Since, however, this stands connected with all the misery of sin, sickness (1 Cor. 11: 30), fear (Heb. 2: 15), and, out of Christ, with eternal death; and since the apostle elsewhere employs the word in a more elevated sense (6: 16, 21. 7: 10 [comp. the contrasted *εἰς ζωήν*], 8: 6. 2 Cor. 7: 10), so here, at least in an obscure way, the ideas of evil and eternal death are to be connected with the word. (Comp. Krabbe, Lehre v. d. Sünde u. d. Tode, s. 196. Rothe, s. 177. Dähne, s. 57 seq.). The more comprehensive idea is without hesitation admitted here by Koppe, Tholuck, Köllner, Rückert (edit. 2, hesitatingly). The contrast *δικαιοσύνη ζωῆς* v. 18, and *ζωὴ αἰώ-*

νιος v. 21, decides not the meaning here with certainty, because in these phrases the idea of a resurrection, in contrast with the death of the body, is the principal and leading one.

Καὶ οὕτως, and so, and consequently (11: 26), i. e. in consequence of the entrance of sin and death into the world; therefore, substantially, in consequence of the connection of sin and death (Olshausen, Meyer); not—of sin by one man, v. 16 (Finkh); not—because Adam died on account of sin (Reiche, Fritzsche).—*Εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους διῆλθεν, diffused itself unto all men*, i. e. came upon or invaded all men; not—*was enforced throughout* (Luther). *Διέρχεσθαι*, to go away from one place to another, to depart any where, Luke 2: 15. Acts 11: 19; also said of something which diffuses itself, Luke 5: 15. —*Πάντας ἀνθρώπους* differs from *κόσμον* as the concrete parts of a thing are diverse from the abstract whole (Rothe); *διέρχεσθαι* from *εἰσέρχεσθαι εἰς τ. κοσ-*, as going from house to house differs from entering into a city.—The second *ὁ θάνατος* is wanting in Mss. D. E. F. G. 62, al. Ital. Aug. al., and in Chrysostom and others it stands after *διῆλθεν*. Probably it is not genuine; and we can well dispense with it, (which Fritzsche denies). At all events, *ὁ θάνατος* is the subject of the verb, [whether we regard it as expressed or implied], and not *ἡ ἁμαρτία κ. ὁ θάν.* (Aug.). It is erroneous, moreover, (Chry., Theod., Reiche, Fritzsche) to limit the *extension*, *διῆλθεν*, to death only; for (1) The diffusion of sin also is partly intimated and partly supposed, in the clauses *ἡ ἁμαρτία . . . εἰσῆλθε*, in *καὶ οὕτως*, and in the following *ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον*; in part it is expressly said in v. 19. (2) One cannot otherwise well comprehend, how sin, which is general, came upon men; nor why merely death, which is the punishment of sin (6: 23), and not sin also, should have come upon Adam and his posterity. To be sure, the apostle regards the death of Adam as the result of a positive and primitive sentence of God (*κρίμα* v. 16); but the diffusion of the same among other men, he could hardly regard in the same light, since no declaration of the Old Testament to such a purpose is anywhere to be found. It is indeed true that in Sir. 25: 24. Wisd. 2: 24, and by many among the Jews (comp. Wetstein, Tholuck, Reiche, Fritzsche, in loc., and my Bib. Dogmatik, § 273, note c), only the death is spoken of which was brought upon men by Adam; and it is even said, that this death has come upon the righteous who have not sinned, (Rabbi Bechai in Lib. כר חקמח, Bava Bathra f. 17, 1. Shabb. f. 55, 2). But it is still a fundamental position of the Old Testament, that all men from their birth are sinners; and this can hardly be explained in any other way than through the fall of Adam. Many of the Jews, moreover, do in

fact derive from this source the general sinfulness of men, e. g. R. Shem Tob in Sepher Haemunoth. The interpreter can have no doubt on this point, viz. that *the apostle teaches the spread of sin as well as death among all men, in and through Adam.* But in respect to the *way* and *manner* in which this takes place, he makes no particular explanations. Adam's first sin, and his death ordained by God as a punishment, were the original cause of a physico-moral corruption. (Paul appears, as also Augustine, to have regarded the first man, though made of dust [1 Cor. 15: 47], as capable before his fall of a natural immortality, Bib. Dogm. § 119]. Death comes undoubtedly in the way of natural propagation. So also in part does sin, which became an inclination that organically propagated itself; in part, however, it was continued and diffused by virtue of a community-state or condition, (Pelagius says, *by imitation*, which is vapid). Finally, one must admit, as the basis of both organic and social propagation, *the original likeness of all men, by virtue of which the sin of Adam becomes common to all, and sin propagated or inherited is still the free act of every man.* (See Lehrb. der Sittenlehre, § 34). The sequel will exhibit an accordance with these views.

Ἐφ' ᾧ is rendered *διότι* by Thomas Mag. and Phavorinus; which is equivalent to *ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὅτι*, (*ἐπί on account of, because that*, Acts 3: 16. Matt. 19: 9. Matth, § 586), and almost all interpreters follow in this track, even Fritzsche, Hermann ad Viger. But Origen, Augustine, Beza, Estius, explain it by *in whom* (Adam). Chrys., Theoph., Oecumenius, Elsner, *on account of whom;* Grotius, *by whom* (Adam); Finkh, *quamquam.* In point of fact, the meaning *because that* fits well this passage; and that in 2 Cor. 5: 4. But Rothe, regarding ἐφ' ᾧ as equivalent to *ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὥστε*, i. e. *under the condition that*, when joined with the Inf. or Indic. Fut. (Matth. § 479), understands it as meaning *under the certainty that, so that, for that, inasmuch as;* comp. Synesius Ep. 73, p. 221 C. edit. Petav: *καὶ τὸν ἥλιον εἶδεν ἐπὶ ῥητοῖς ἄνθρωπος ἐφ' ᾧ Γεννάδιον ἔγραψεν*, "and by agreement a man saw the light of the sun *on condition that* he impeached Gennadius," (Zeunius ad Viger. p. 30, "*hac lege ut* Gennadium in jus vocaret;" Hermann, p. 710, in opposition to this, "*eam ob causam* quod Gennadium accusasset.") Theophilus Ant. ad Autol. Lib. II. p. 105, B. ed. Colon., *ἐφ' ᾧ οὐκ ἴσχυσε θανατῶσαι αὐτούς, under the certainty that, so that,* he could not kill them. But here *because* is the only apposite meaning. By this method of explanation we attain to the idea, that the death of Adam's posterity *together with their sinning* was fixed, the one as the condition of the other; while the common view presents this matter as though each one's own proper sin was

the cause of his death. In the meantime, Paul does not mean, by his *πάντες ἥμαρτον*, either that *all became sinful* (Calv., Thol.), or that *all suffered the penalty of sin* (Grotius, Chrys. *γεγόνασι θνητοί*), but *he asserts merely the actual development of sin that pertained to all in the actual sin of all, and the justice of the punishment on the ground of individual accountability.* This contradicts neither the deeper connection above alleged between the sin of Adam and of his posterity, nor the ideal or immediate imputation of the first; nor does it in any way exclude the individual or the mediate.

The preceding clause may seemingly contradict 4: 15, "Where there is no law, there is no transgression;" and hence the apostle proceeds here to vindicate it (*γάρ*). *Ἄχρι νόμου*, not *to the end of* (during) *the law* (Orig., Chrys., Theodoret); which indeed the usus loquendi would allow (Fritzsche against Rückert), but *until the law*, i. e. from Adam to Moses (v. 14), having respect to 4: 15.—*Ἁμαρτία ἦν*, *sin was*, i. e. there was sinning; in which Paul has reference to the testimony of Genesis respecting the corruption of men before the time of Moses.—*Ἁμαρτία . . . νόμου*, a concession or limitation (*δέ*), *sin however was not reckoned*, i. e. not brought into account (Phil. v. 18), viz. objectively, but not by the civil judge (Fritzsche), but by God (Estius, Bengel, Olshausen, Reiche, Köllner, Rothe); not by the sinner himself (Aug., Amb., Luther, Melancth., Calvin, Beza, Balduin, Usteri, Rückert), for the word *ἐλλογεῖν* supposes a relation between *two*, of whom one reckons something to the other. Besides, the customary psychology of the apostle does not lead to this, (comp. *ἐπίγνωσις τῆς ἁμαρτίας*, 3: 20, and *οἱ λογισμοὶ κατηγορούντες*, 2: 15.—*Where no law is*, or *where the law is not*, which comes at last to the same thing; for this is always said respecting the time before the law of Moses, and is by no means a universal position. [But comp. 4: 15, where this is first said, and where the strain of the reasoning shows that the assertion is of a general nature. It must be as true at one time, as at another, from the very nature of the case. Is not the position of De Wette then, in this case, a very doubtful one?—Tr.]. The Noachic precept in Gen. 9: 6 Paul does not appear to have looked upon in the light of a positive law, since he considers the time before Moses to have been *without law.* This clause of limitation, however, is itself again to be limited. Sin is either to be reckoned, or it is not sin. The apostle, therefore, in respect to sins before the time of Moses, does not simply and positively deny accountability, but only in a *relative* or *comparative* sense; just as he says of the heathen: As many as have sinned *ἀνόμως*, shall also perish *ἀνόμως*, 2: 12. Now punishment presupposes *accountability*, although it may be in a

lesser degree. Well known is the distinction between intentional and unintentional sins, (Luke 12: 47 seq. Sittenlehre, § 31). Both, however, are to be accounted for in the way of punishment. Intentional sin, committed against an express law, Paul names *παράβασις*, 4: 15. The clause before us then must mean: 'Where there is no law, there sin is not reckoned as a *παράβασις*, i. e. as a transgression of a positive precept, (Est.), and so the sentiment is the same as that in 4: 15. (Dähne says: The verb *ἐλλογεῖται* must be limited by mentally supplying *νόμῳ* or *ἐκ νόμου*). Because now the very idea of sin presupposes a violation of some law, and the apostle ascribes sin to the times which preceded Moses, so Rosenmüller and Calovius are in the right, when they suppose that the law of nature must be here in view. They do not, however, do this in the way of an orderly connection of thought. Meyer, after Süsskind, doubting the affirmative declaration of what the passage before us contains, has taken the clause in an *interrogative* sense, the answer to which is to be in the negative;—a sheer mistake.

(V. 14.) *But death reigned*, etc.; *but*, in contrast with the foregoing limitation. Meaning: Death was a universal necessity to which all were subjected. If we dwell now on the relation of this clause to the preceding context, it is clear that the apostle means to confirm the assertion, that *death has passed through upon all men*, in contrast with the clause that *sin is not imputed*, etc. But is the causal clause, which follows, *because all have sinned*, rendered null? Just as little as the idea of sin is annulled by the *οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται, κ. τ. λ*, which is to be relatively understood. Hence the sentiment of the Apostle is: *All have, through their own sin, although not to be accounted for on the ground of a positive law, brought death upon themselves.*

Even over those who did not sin, i. e. notwithstanding the diversity of sin, still *death came upon all.* Ἐπί does not denote *extent* (Meyer), but *on* or *upon*, Luke 19: 14. The genuineness of *καί* is not shaken by the few Mss. which omit it, (viz. 67** Clar.). Moreover the *καί* affords a ground or reason for the genuineness of the *μή* here, without which it would be destitute of meaning. Cod. 62. 63. 67, et al. apud Rufin., Ambrosiaster, Origen, Cyprian, al., omit the *μή*; but the testimony of almost all the Mss., and of many of the fathers, speaks in its favour with a force of evidence decidedly superior. In fact, the omission of the *μή* is plainly a mere expedient to get rid of an apparent contradiction (at least according to the Latin version) between this clause and the *ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον.*

After the similitude of Adam's transgression. Ἐπί, *after the manner of*, comp. 6: 5, and see *ἐπί* in 2 Cor. 9: 6. Luke 1: 59, where *ἐπί*

designates the idea of a *normal* conformity. The present clause stands connected with ἁμαρτήσαντες and not with ἐβασίλευσεν. Chrys., Theoph., Bengel, connect the reign of death over men before the law with the similitude of Adam's transgression; Elsner thus, "propter imaginem peccati Adami," i. e. on account of inherited sin; Homberg, Finkh. But in this way here would be a direct contradiction with the ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον, [which brings men's *own sin* into the account,—TR.]. The emphasis lies upon παράβασις, the transgression of a definite command. Photius: "Adam transgressed and sinned against a law definite and sanctioned; but they sinned, contemning the self taught reason of nature." Erroneous is it to assume, with Beza, that the sinfulness of children is here meant; for the apostle has no special reference to their mortality, although it may be included in his general position. Equally so to assume, with Grotius and Wetstein, that such as have not sinned at all, but lived piously, are meant. Reiche, plainly without good reason, finds the difference not in the sinning but in the *punishment*, which in Adam's case was immediate, in that of his posterity mediate. Plainly the words καὶ ἐπὶ . . . Ἀδαμ form a limitation of the above declaration, *because that all have sinned*, like to that which is made by the foregoing ἁμαρτία δὲ οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται κ. τ. λ., so that now the full idea of the apostle is this: *All have by their own sin, although this is not reckoned after any positive law and is different from the transgression of Adam, occasioned death to themselves.* It is erroneous, therefore, to attribute the mortality of men merely to Adam's death, and to derive it wholly from natural propagation, (Chrys., Theophyl., Theodoret, who however admits the sin of posterity). It is erroneous, also, while the sinning of posterity is admitted, to refer back the punishment of death, which they suffer on account of sinning, immediately to the sentence of God against Adam; for in such case, the circumstance that death *accompanies sin* is overlooked, for in conformity with this, death comes upon all *because all have sinned.* In itself not erroneous, but still not within the circle of the apostle's thought, is it to seek the moral ground of death in the immediate imputation of Adam's transgression (Köllner, with the older theologians); or in the guilt connected with inherited sin (Bengel, Elsner). According to Paul, the ground of death lies in the *actual* sin of men, which is by virtue of their original connection with Adam's sin, (not by an arbitrary decree of God, but by a natural moral arrangement), so that their sin, like his, is punished with death.

Who is the type of the future [*Adam*]. This refers back to v. 12, and what is there implied, is here expressly said, as to the similitude between Adam and Christ. Ὅς refers to Adam, and is not through

attraction to be referred to the foregoing words, so as to be equivalent to ὅ (Koppe).—*Τύπος, type, resemblance, example* (Phil. 3: 17); and here, as in 1 Cor. 10: 6, *historical type, parallel*, and in this case a type by reason of similitude in the way of contrast. A historically objective connection between type and antitype, so that one is a necessary condition to the other, has Paul in this case full surely assumed.—*Τοῦ μέλλοντος*, not neuter = the future, viz. future salvation (Koppe), but masc., meaning *Adam*, comp. 1 Cor. 15: 45. So Neve Shalom, II. 5. 8, speaks of *the other Adam* (Thol., Fritzsche); moreover, not *of him who formerly was to come* (Beza, Reiche), but, in reference to the then present time, for which Christ as triumphant was yet to be manifested (Fritzsche).

Vs. 15—17. *These exhibit, in a striking manner, the points of contrast between the type and the antitype, or their contrasted relations to each other; and this leads to an investigation of the relation itself.*

(V. 15.) *Ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς . . . χάρισμα*, i. e. *not as the offence so is the free gift.* In other words: Although Adam is a type of Christ, there are points of difference or contrast between the offence of the former and the free gift of the latter. Some (Homberg, Heumann, Rosenm.) make this verse with v. 16 an interrogation; erroneously, for thereby the contrast is destroyed.—*Τὸ παράπτωμα, offence, stumbling*, designates the transgression of Adam = *παράβασις* in v. 14, which was the ground of the reign of sin after him. *Παράπτωμα* always designates an *actual specific transgression*, and differs from *ἁμαρτία* in this respect, viz. that the latter is generic, comp. v. 20.—*Τὸ χάρισμα, the gracious gift*, i. e. justification, forms no direct contrast to the preceding word; and one might have expected to find *ὑπακοή* here, as in v. 19. Paul however has his eye here upon the *consequences* of Adam's transgression, and to these he opposes (as he well might) *τὸ χάρισμα*.

The remainder of the verse, *εἰ γὰρ τῷ . . . ἐπερίσσευσε*, represents the first point of contrast between *παράπτωμα* and *χάρισμα*; and this is presented in the way of a hypothetical conclusion, in which the reasoning is *a minore ad majus*, viz. *If* (so and so) . . . *then so much the more* (thus and so). Does *πολλῷ μᾶλλον* refer to a more of *quantity*, i. e. to a more intensive manifestation of force or energy? (Theophct., Calv., Beza, Thol., Rückert, Köllner, Reiche, Rothe); or, as in 5: 9 seq., does it mark a *logical more* of possibility or certainty? (Chrys., Grotius, Fritzsche). The point is still in dispute. In the meantime, the first method of interpretation places the difference between the operation of the offence and of the free gift in a more conspicuous point of light. (So Rothe, Rückert). The relation of the fore-clause to the corresponding after-clause, is that of a contrast in which one of

its parallels has an increased intensity. Comparison manifests this; for (1) The *οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπέθανον* of the fore-clause, wherein lies the idea of extended influence, corresponds to the *εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐπερίσσευσε* of the after-clause. The apostle here employs *οἱ πολλοί*, and not *πάντες* as in v. 12, because he could not say, on the one hand, that grace had extended to all. In like manner, in such cases, *οἱ πολλοί* in Matt. 20: 28. 26: 28. (2) To the *παράπτωμα* in the fore-clause corresponds, in the latter clause, not *χάρισμα* as before, but *ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ δωρεὰ τῆς χάριτος*, which does not mean merely *the gracious gift* (Thol.), or the like, but presents the idea of *χάρισμα* both in the bestowment of it and in its source. *Χάρις* is not, as in v. 17, the operation of grace, but *operative grace*, for the other view would weaken the sentiment here.—*Ἐν χάριτι . . . Χριστοῦ* belongs to or connects with *ἐπερίσσευσε*, and marks the manner of the mediation; it should not be connected with *ἡ χάρις . . . δωρεά* (Köllner, Rothe). It is equivalent to *ἐν Χριστῷ*, only more emphatic, inasmuch as his grace (propitiatory love, 2 Cor. 8: 9) is named as the medium of divine grace. The article in *τῇ τοῦ ἑνὸς κ. τ. λ*, is also emphatic: per benevolentiam quae unius est Christi, (Fritzsche, comp. Rothe). (3) To the *τοῦ ἑνός* in the fore-clause, corresponds *τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου* in the after-clause.—*Ἐπερίσσευσε*, comp. 3: 7. The Aorist relates to the actual participation of the *πολλοί*, i. e. of Christians in time already past.

(V. 16.) A second designation of dissimilitudes. *Καὶ οὐκ ὡς . . . τὸ δώρημα.* The verb *ἐστι* is of course implied. The various reading, *ἁμαρτήματος* (D. E. F. G. Syr. Vulg. Theodoret, all.) has Lachmann rightly excluded from the text. It is manifestly a mere correction of the common reading.—*Δι' ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος*, Rothe and Meyer interpret without any supplement; Rothe as follows: *And the free gift is not in the same way as through one having sinned*, i. e. the free gift is not limited after the manner of one who has sinned. But (1) This is too subtile. (2) There is nothing in the tenor of the following discourse respecting such a difference. (3) In this way, the contrast of *ἑνός* would be destroyed. Meyer gives the phrase the following turn: *And not as through one who has sinned, is the free gift*, i. e. this is not so as if it were occasioned by one who had sinned. In like manner Fritzsche: "*τὸ δώρημα* non sic habere [ait Paulus], quemadmodum *δι' ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος* [*τὸ παράπτωμα* existiterit]," i. e. he makes out a supplement with *παράπτωμα ἐγένετο*. This means, according to him, that the *free gift* differs from the *offence* in this respect, viz. that the former was not, like the latter, introduced by one who sinned. Against this view there are several objections.

(1) The first clause here must impliedly include within itself that which the subsequent development and confirmation comprised in *τὸ μὲν γὰρ κ. τ. λ.* contains. But according to this interpretation, both *κατάκριμα* and *δικαίωμα* are excluded, and all hangs merely upon *ἑνός*. (2) This exegesis makes *διά* = *ἐκ*, or the reverse. But *διά* marks the *original cause*, (and as the cause of the *δώρημα* no one would think of Adam), and *ἐκ* the *occasion*. In the first clause, Theophylact and Reiche anticipatively supply *τὸ κατάκριμα*; Bengel, Tholuck, Köllner, prefer *τὸ κρίμα*. Paul could not well have intended for a supplement here the principal assertion in v. 12, *ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν . . . ὁ θάνατος*, because the idea of sin is already comprised in *εἰς ἁμαρτήσας*. Neither did he regard *ὁ θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν* as a supplement (Grotius, Estius, Koppe), because he thought here in an indefinite way of the consequences of having sinned, and intended afterwards to give a more particular explanation. Paul gives here merely the original cause; for he virtually repeats here what is said in v. 12, *δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου κ. τ. λ*, merely substituting *ἁμαρτήσαντος* for *ἀνθρώπου*, because the idea of sin committed could not here be dispensed with. Beza deals arbitrarily here with the laws of grammar, since he converts into a substantive the whole clause, by prefixing *τό*. He however very nearly hits upon the true sense. This seems strictly to be as follows: *And not like to that which took place through one that sinned, is the free gift.* The word *δώρημα* is more indefinite than *χάρισμα*; and this corresponds well with the somewhat indefinite *δι' ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος*.

Τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρίμα . . . κατάκριμα, scil. *ἐγένετο, judgment was by reason of one unto condemnation.* Rothe's construction: *τὸ μὲν* [scil. *δι' ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος*] *γάρ ἐστι κρίμα*, does not at all fit the passage. —*Ἐξ ἑνός* of course implies *ἁμαρτήσαντος* (Meyer), or else *ἀνθρώπου*, comp. vs. 12, 15, 17. To make a complement here of *ἁμαρτήματος* (Beza, Thol., Rothe) is forbidden by the laws of language, and by no means rendered necessary on account of the *ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων*, since the like contrast is presented between one sinner and many sins, as between one sin and many sins.

Τὸ κρίμα . . . κατάκριμα Fritzsche explains thus: 'The forbidding of the fruit, and the sentence against Adam and all who sinned after him.' Reiche thus: 'The sentence against Adam, and that against his posterity.' Rückert (2) Thus: 'The one who had sinned was stricken by the divine sentence and the consequence thereof, viz. death; from him has gone forth sentence throughout all, and become a sentence of condemnation to all.' Theophylact: 'Sin, deservedly condemnable, flowing from one, Adam, became a matter of condem-

nation, i. e. of death, or of more sins, ever after to his posterity.' That *κατάκριμα* has reference to posterity, and that the sentiment is to be completed by an implied *ἐγένετο* and *εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους*, (which Meyer names anticipative), is certain from v. 18. One must comprise under it what lies in vs. 12, 19; and consequently not merely *θάνατος* (Reiche), but also *ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν*. *Τὸ κρίμα* cannot mean merely the *prohibition* before the fall, because *ἐξ ἑνός* does not mean *through one* (Fritzsche), but *from* or *out of one*; and *κρίμα* therefore is conceived of as something which had befallen Adam, and by reason of this had also befallen others. The sentiment of Reiche and Rückert, then, as given above, seems to be correct.

Τὸ δὲ χάρισμα . . . εἰς δικαίωμα, scil. *ἐγένετο*. *Χάρισμα* again introduces the more definite idea of the gracious gift on account of the *δικαίωμα*, which is not to be understood as in v. 18 (Rothe), but as the opposite of *κατάκριμα*, with the meaning that attaches itself to the Pauline use of *δικαιοῦν*, viz. *sentence of absolution*. It is parallel with the *δικαίωσις* of v. 18, i. e. acquittal (Fritzsche).—*Ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων*, *springing from* or *occasioned by many offences*, i. e. as the *κατάκριμα* was incurred by men who sinned much, this gave occasion for the large manifestations of pardoning and justifying grace.—The second point of difference between Adam's influence and that of Christ consists in this, that in the first case sentence occasioned by one sinner became condemnation; in the second, the gracious gift in the way of justification was on the occasion of many sins.

(V. 17.) Here Paul confirms (*γάρ*) the last thought of the preceding verse, *εἰς δικαίωμα* (Fritzsche), inasmuch as he, by a conclusion like that in v. 15, renders prominent the glorious consequences of justification. At the same time, however, he brings to view a third point of difference between the influence of Adam and of Christ, viz. that of much greater dominion. Rothe denies this connection, and attaches v. 17 to v. 15, making v. 16 a parenthesis. It is decisive against this, that the *τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης* of v. 17 presupposes the *εἰς δικαίωμα* of v. 16, and connects itself with it. (Comp. Rückert.)

Τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώμα. The various reading, *ἐν* (*ἐν τῷ*) *ἑνὶ παραπτώματι* corresponds to the erroneous reading above, viz. *ἁμαρτήματος* for *ἁμαρτήσαντος*, v. 16, and belongs to the same Codices, only here some other witnesses are wanting. On the other hand, A. has *ἐν ἑνί*, and Origen *ἐν ἑνός*. Lachmann reads arbitrarily, *ἑνὶ παραπτώματι*, which Koellner and Rothe approve. Meyer holds *ἐν ἑνί* as original, while Fritzsche supports the common Var. Lect. on account of consistency. Plainly *τοῦ ἑνός* is superfluous, on account of the fol-

lowing *διὰ τοῦ ἑνός*. The apostle, in the first place, employs *τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματος* as corresponding to v. 15; then, as corresponding to *δι' ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος* and *ἐξ ἑνός* in v. 16, he employs *διὰ τοῦ ἑνός*; the last particularly, because at the close of this investigation he wishes to make prominent the parallel between Adam and Christ. The contrasts, on the other hand, which he intends to bring particularly into view, are (1) *By the offence of one* (with the implied spread of its consequences)—and *they who receive abundance of grace and the gift of justification.* (2) *Death reigned — they shall reign in life.* Paul has put in contrast with *τῷ τοῦ ἑνος παραπτώματι* the opposite phrase *τῇ περισσείᾳ, κ. τ. λ*; and in opposition to *ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσε* he has not opposed *ἡ ζωὴ βασιλεύσει,* as we expect; but he has chosen another turn of expression which brings into view free moral personality, the predicates of which are *life* and *dominion* (*βασιλεία*), (comp. Rothe). The form of the conclusion is the same as in v. 15; and *πολλῷ μᾶλλον* is to be taken here as there.

Οἱ . . . λαμβάνοντες is equivalent to *οἱ πολλοὶ εἰς οὓς ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ κ. τ. λ,* and of like import with *ἐπερίσσευσε* in v. 15, and *καὶ τὸ χάρισμα εἰς δικαίωμα ἐγένετο* in v. 16. The *ἡ περισσεία* answers to *ἐπερίσσευσε*; the *τῆς χάριτος* to the *ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ,* only that here, as in 1: 5, it is conceived of as an operation, or as something introduced and appropriated; *τῆς δωρεᾶς* is used as in v. 15, only with a meaning adapted to *justification* borrowed from the sentiment of v. 16. The omission of *τῆς δωρεᾶς* in B. 49. Orig., Chrys., al.; likewise the omission of *τῆς δικαιοσύνης* in C. 70* Orig.; as also the various readings, *τὴν δωρεάν* and *καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς καὶ τῆς δικαιοσύνης*; are all mere corrections for the sake of avoiding many Genitives. The connection of *τῆς δωρεᾶς* with *τὴν περισσείαν* is proper on account of v. 15, and the common various reading gives a correct meaning.

Οἱ λαμβάνοντες (pres. Part.), one might expect *λάβοντες* (Aor.), so Fritzsche, Meyer; but the Part. pres. here marks the *continued* appropriation of grace (Rothe).—*Ἐν ζωῇ*, the opposite of *θάνατος*, and not merely the resurrection of the body is meant, but also a spiritual and moral resurrection; just as in the *θάνατος* which is by sin (v. 12), a spiritual and moral death is included.

Βασιλεύσουσι is here employed, because in the contrasted clause we have *ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσε.* However, the same expression is elsewhere (2 Tim. 2: 12) employed with the like meaning, i. e. to designate future happiness. The like in Rev. 20: 4. 22: 5, but there partly with reference to an objective Messianic kingdom, and partly in a subjective moral sense, because *to reign* implies the highest development of freedom and the highest gratification of every desire.

(V. 18.) *Ἄρα οὖν*, a well known inference particle of Paul, and contrary to Greek usage placed at the beginning, (7: 3, 25. 8: 12, et saepe). It serves here as an introduction to the summing up of what precedes (vs. 16, 17). That it does not fall back upon v. 12 (Rothe), one may see from the words *παράπτωμα* and *κατάκριμα* (which are in vs. 16, 17). It is only in v. 19, that *ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν* looks back to the *ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον* of v. 12. After *δι' ἑνὸς παραπτώματος* here, the supplement is commonly made of *τὸ κρίμα ἐγένετο*, (and so Rückert, Fritzsche); and after *δι' ἑνὸς δικαιώματος* the supplement *τὸ χάρισμα ἐγένετο* is regarded as implied. The better way is to supply the less definite *ἐγένετο, ἀπέβη, happened to, came to* or *upon*. In the second clause, if a verb were supplied, it must be in the Future (Fritzsche); designedly therefore did the apostle omit the verb, so as to leave out the limitation of time, because he here extends his view to all, *εἰς πάντας*.

Δι' ἑνὸς παραπτώματος. To construe this as being of the masc. gender, (so do Koppe, Tholuck, Fritzsche), is against the idiom, and even against its conformity to v. 17, which joins the article with *παραπτώματι* (Rothe), although the view of Koppe, etc., rests on a supposed conformity of the two passages. The same is true respecting *δι' ἑνὸς δικαιώματος*. This word is here employed in a sense different from that which it has in v. 16, and designates the opposite of *παράπτωμα*, i. e. *righteous doing* (Rev. 19: 8. Bar. 2: 19, not *means of justification*, Beza, Bengel), and is equivalent to *ὑπακοή* in v. 19. (Meyer, *sentence of acquittal;* Rothe, *fulfilment of justice*, both erroneously). The word *ὑπακοή* refers to the death of Jesus, which was a proof of the most perfect obedience, and thereby was a moral action of the highest kind. Reiche and Fritzsche attach to the *δικαιώματος* here the idea of Jesus' incarnation, Phil. 2: 5 seq. The older theologians find their *active obedience* here, (Form. Concord. p. 684 seq.)

Εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς, to justification of life, i. e. to a justification which frees us from death, and makes us partakers of life.

(V. 19.) *Γάρ*, before an explanatory sentence, as elsewhere in like way. The *εἰς κατάκριμα* of v. 18 is here explained by *ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν*, and the *εἰς δικαίωσιν* by *δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται.*— *Ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν, were made sinners. Ἁμαρτωλοί* must here have its full meaning, i. e. that of active and then of suffering sinners. Chrys., Theophl., *ὑπεύθυνοι κολάσει*, erroneously. *Καθιστάται* means *sistere, constituere, to present, to set forth*, and then *to make into something*, 2 Pet. 1: 8. In the passive, *to be made this* or *that, to become*, without any exact parallel in the New Testament; for James 4: 4,

καθίσταται may be of the Middle Voice; pass. in Thucyd. II. 65 (Fritzsche). That it is altogether equivalent to γίνεσθαι (Phavorinus), is incorrect. It always means *to be made* something. On the other hand, one must not, with Grotius and Boehme, explain it as meaning *they are treated as sinners;* nor with Koppe, Reiche, and Fritzsche, *they appear as sinners*, viz. in consequence of the penalty of death coming upon them, (Fritz. "eorum mors eos peccavisse ostendit.") The simple thought is, *They are become actual sinners;* not merely through imputation, (Beza, Bengel). Comp. notes on v. 12. So in the after-clause, δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται, not, *they shall be righteous;* not, *they shall be treated as righteous*, but *be made righteous* = be justified; and this, not through the imputation of active obedience of another, but in accordance with the usual idea of justification, i. e. pardoning mercy. The Fut. tense is employed here, as in 3: 30, because justification in respect to the many is not yet completed. Reiche refers it to the future revelation of the glory of Christians after the resurrection (?).

ARTICLE IV.

THE PRODUCE OF THE VINEYARD IN THE EAST.

By Rev. Henry Homes, American Missionary at Constantinople.

In a country where wine, as in America, is known as a great promoter of the crime of drunkenness, and where the vintage is supposed to be gathered chiefly for the purpose of making wine, it is difficult for the mind to do justice to the common language of Scripture which extols the vine and its products as one of the staffs of life. The fruits of the vine, designated by ten different words in the Bible, that are translated wine in our version, are in more than thirty different passages, associated with the tithes and offerings, or with corn and oil, as emblems of temporal blessings. Along with the field of grain is mentioned the vineyard; along with the harvest is mentioned the vintage; along with corn and oil, wine is almost always combined as the third representative of the three chief blessings of the year. We will quote but two of the many passages of this kind. "And he will love thee and bless thee and multiply thee: he will also bless the fruit of thy womb, and the fruit of thy land, thy corn, and thy wine (*tirosh*) and

thine oil, etc." Deut. 7: 13. "For the children of Israel and the children of Levi shall bring the offering of the corn, of the new wine (*tirosh*) and the oil unto the chambers." Neh. 10: 39.

Additional honor is bestowed upon the vine, by the number of illustrations of the most precious truths that are drawn from it. The church and its members are most beautifully pictured as being united to Christ as the branch is united to the vine; Christ's servants are described as laborers in his vineyard; the church is the planted vine brought out of Egypt, the vine watered and protected by God; and Christ encourages his disciples with the promise of drinking with them the fruit of the vine new in his Father's kingdom. Nothing in the material world is so often employed in the Scriptures, as a symbol to convey spiritual truths, as the vine and its fruit.

Now when we recall to mind, that wine is supposed to be the chief thing obtained from the vine, and that as a fermented liquor it contains a certain per centage of alcohol, and that there is no substance now called wine by any one that is not intoxicating, it must introduce confusion into the minds of many, to understand how the vine is worthy to be exalted in the word of God into such a conspicuous place for our admiration. Enlightened reason approves of all the denunciations of intemperance found in the Bible, and also of its approbation of abstinence from intoxicating drinks, and therefore the mind asks that the propriety and consistency should be shown, of making such a natural source of evil as the vineyard and its fruit is supposed to be, emblems of the staff of life along with corn and oil.

Many, it seems to us, show more embarrassment in the treatment of this question than might be expected, and very extreme assertions have been hazarded on the subject. The source of this embarrassment seems to arise in great measure from the supposition, that the chief produce of the vineyard is and was that which we at this day universally call wine, and that the vineyard was cultivated chiefly for its yielding such wine, which we all know to be an intoxicating liquor.

Now, as a resident of the East, we believe that sufficient facts can be adduced to render it extremely probable that this supposition is erroneous, and that the fabrication of an intoxicating liquor was never the chief object for which the grape was cultivated among the Jews. There were other products of the grape equally, and when all taken together, much more important than the portion of the grapes which were manfactured into wine. If the grape had been abused in Judea, to the extent that it is now in some countries, being used mainly for procuring an intoxicating liquor; or if it had been of no more use for general purposes, than it is in the more northern coun-

tries of Europe, one may venture to suppose that it would never have held in the Bible the prominent place as a precious product that it now does. Perhaps the vine to the people of Judea was a plant which offered even a greater abundance of varied productions, than it does to the people of Asia Minor and Syria at the present day. Joined with the bread fruits and the olive tree, the three might well, under the comprehensive words of corn, wine (*tirosh*) and oil, be representatives of the productions most essential to them, at the same time that they were those most abundantly provided for the support of life.

The existence of this variety of manufactures from the grape among the Jews, is suggested from the large number of Hebrew words translated by the single word "wine," and is distinctly intimated in Numbers 6: 3, 4. "He shall separate himself from wine and strong drink, and shall drink no vinegar of wine or vinegar of strong drink, neither shall he drink any liquor of grapes, nor eat moist grapes or dried. All the days of his separation shall he eat nothing that is made of the vine tree, from the kernels even to the husk." It would be foreign to our object to attempt to show what manufactures from the grape were indicated by any of these words employed in Scripture; but we recall their variety to the mind of the reader, that he may be prepared to make an inference from the statements we are about to make in regard to the varied productions of the vineyard in Turkey, as to what may have formerly been the fact as to the variety of productions of the same in Judea.

The remarkable fact is that in Asia Minor and Syria, the largest part of the produce of the vine is used for other purposes than making intoxicating liquors. In both of these countries, three quarters of the people, being Moslems, regard the drinking of wine as a sin, and neither make wine or drink it; and yet by far the largest portion of the vineyards is owned by this same people. The Greek, Armenian, and other Christians, who make and drink wine, are also in the same position; only a small portion of the whole produce of their vineyards is made into wine, although this is not true of all localities. I have asked Christians from Diarbekir, Aintab, and other places in the interior of Asia Minor, and all concur in the same statement. Rev. E. Smith writes in reference to Syria: "*Wine is not the most important, but rather the least so, of all the objects for which the vine is cultivated,*"[1] and again speaking of Bhamdun, "the wine made is an item of no consideration." Dr. Robinson says, "No wine is made from the very extensive vineyards of Hebron, except a little by the Jews."[2] The quantity of grapes that is made into wine is probably greater than at

[1] Bib. Sacra, Nov. 1846.

[2] Biblical Researches, Vol. II. p. 442.

any former period, owing to the corruption and degradation of the Christian population, and also of the Mohammedan. Yet where the people have preserved anything of the original simplicity of their customs, the amount of wine made is proportionably small. On the contrary, the amount made increases near commercial cities. Still in the vine-growing districts of Turkey, the grape stands as prominent among the productions of the country as a source of comfort and prosperity, as the Bible makes it to have been among the productions of Judea.

Our readers may now be demanding, "since wine is not made from the grape, what is the varied produce of the vine that renders it so valuable to the people?" In answering this question, we propose to enumerate successively all the different uses of the vine, as far as known at the present day in the East. Such an enumeration we have never known to be made; travellers have not been aware what a staple article for the supply of a multiplicity of wants was to be found in the grape, and our practical moralists in treating on the use of wine have had no complete information on the existing varieties of "liquor of grapes," Num. 6: 3. Some of the manufactures of grape liquor which we shall mention, though probably known to the ancient Greeks and Romans, have never been alluded to by any modern traveller.

1. The first produce of the vineyard which we find is the *Green Grape*, חִרְצַנִּים, Num. 6: 4. It is used for its verjuice, to give a tart taste to all articles of food that need it, and for making refreshing drinks. The manner of using it is various, either by putting the fresh green grapes into the food, or by drying the same in the sun and putting them up in bags like raisins, or by pressing out the juice, partially evaporating it in the sun, and carefully preserving it in bottles, or lastly, after having thoroughly dried the green grape, it is ground to powder in a mill, and the powder bottled. These various preparations give thus a fresh tart vegetable juice for all seasons of the year for cooking meat and vegetables for the table; and in regions where they are never accustomed to see a lemon, they supply the place of lemonade. A drink made from the juice of the green grape is also most reviving to the parched and weary traveller.

2. The *Fresh Ripe Grape* in the regions where it is cultivated may be had from three to five months in succession (Lev. 26: 5), owing to the difference of vines, soil and climate of a particular district. During these months, and indeed for many following months, as will be seen, combined with bread, it is the main reliance of the people for food to eat; for theirs is a "land of bread and vineyards," 2 Kings 18: 32. Grapes are not sold in the interior towns at two or three

shillings a pound, but at the astonishingly low price of from one quarter of a cent to one cent a pound; and even in Constantinople, with all the causes of dearness, the common sorts of grapes can be had for two or three cents a pound. They are so innocuous, that in general one may eat of them with greater freedom than any other kind of fruit, even to satiety. It is not to be wondered at that so luscious a fruit, which can be obtained at a cheaper rate than potatoes by the poor in Ireland, should form in some districts, with oil and bread, the chief nourishment of the people; and that the vine should be extensively cultivated for the sake of its solid fruit merely.

3. Fresh *grapes are hung up in dry places* in the shade and preserved on the cluster, with a little *wilting*, to eat in the winter; so that in this manner the time of fresh grapes is protracted for at least two months longer. Mr. Schneider of Broosa remarks, that this kind of grapes is sold there as late as February and March; the price is nearly as low as that of freshly gathered grapes.

4. *Raisins.* In the villages the grapes are hung in clusters on the side of the houses, or strowed on blankets on the tops of the houses to dry, and thus they prolong the fruits of the vintage for the months when the hung grapes are gone. Of their use for all kinds of cakes in cookery, as also for an accompaniment to bread, we need not speak, though it should be kept in mind to aid in our estimate of the value of the whole gathering from the vine, when used in the form of the solid fruit.

5. *Preserves made with fresh grape juice.* One of the very common uses of the grape, is to boil the freshly expressed *must* before it is twenty-four hours old, after having removed the acidity and checked the tendency to ferment by throwing in calcareous earth, and then to boil with it various kinds of fruits and vegetables for sauces and preserves for the whole year. The most usual fruits employed are apples, quinces, plums and peaches; and of vegetables, green tomatos, egg plants, pumpkins, squashes and watermelon rinds. They are quartered and sometimes pared as with us; then a quantity sufficient for one caldron having been left for half an hour in lime water, in a bag, it is taken out and poured into the boiling juice to boil for several hours. The result is a preparation more liquid and the fruit less combined with the juice, than in the case of apples boiled with cider must. Mr. Schneider speaking of Broosa remarks, "An *enormous* quantity of *Retchel*" (the name in Turkish for this kind of preserves) is made in Broosa." And the same is true of many other districts.

6. *Jellies and confectionary from fresh grape juice.* There are other common but singular modes of using grape juice, which consist

in throwing into the juice, prepared as above mentioned, various preparations, as of the ground or broken grains of millet, wheat, barley, rice, or almonds and nuts, and especially the starch of wheat. We will give but two or three examples of these manufactures. (1) Starch or flour is thrown into the boiling juice, and when thought to be sufficiently boiled, the syrup is poured out upon cloths to dry in the sun. Broken pistachios, almonds or walnuts are strowed upon the sheet while the material is yet soft, which is then doubled, dried, and is ready for use. A thicker kind is made by pouring the mixture into dishes, and then cutting the mass into square morsels, which when dry are sold in the market like nuts. Other kinds are made to be eaten while fresh, which resemble jellies. (2) Wheat and similar grains which have been soaked in water, are pounded to a pulp or mash, and left sufficient time to ferment. When this is boiled with the grape juice, the mass in the caldron is made into cakes, which when dried have a sour-sweet taste. (3) Pistachios, almonds, filberts and the like, having been strung on strings are dipped in the boiling mixture of starch and juice and hung up to dry, covered with the soft sweet paste of the caldron. There are many other similar manufactures, known each by its peculiar name, which are brought to the large cities for sale. The emigrants from the country to the city, speak with glowing animation and yearnings for home when they allude to these luxuries of their native regions. Perhaps they are designated in the word אֲשִׁישָׁה of the Hebrew, so variously translated in different versions. 2 Sam. 6: 19. Hos. 3: 1. 1 Chron. 16: 3. Sol. Song 2: 5.

7. *Pickled grapes.* This is a translation of the Turkish words, though it is not exactly descriptive of the character of the preparation. Clusters of good ripe grapes are carefully placed in wooden or earthen vessels, so as to two-thirds fill them. Fresh must, boiled down to one *half*, is then poured in so as to fill the vessels, which are then carefully closed and left to stand from fifteen to twenty days. When ready for use the grapes and juice are offered together, to be eaten and drunk. The grapes and the drink are so far exhilarating in quality, that they are used by the Christians during Lent instead of wine, and also by Moslems who are forbidden to drink wine. The odor from the vessel is most agreeable, but the liquor is too sour to suit unaccustomed palates.

8. *Grape Syrup or Molasses.* Perhaps this article should be called *grape sugar* rather than molasses, but as it is not properly crystallizable, and resembles molasses in appearance, while the article mentioned in No. 10, most resembles sugar, we prefer to let the names stand.

This molasses is made of must that has not been pressed more than twenty-four hours. Upon the grapes before pressing or upon the expressed juice, calcareous earth is often thrown to neutralize the acids, and purify the juice. After the effervescence is over, a solid mass insoluble in the liquor is formed in the bottom of the caldron, constituting a tartrate of lime.

The juice is boiled from five to seven hours and reduced down to one fifth or one fourth of the original quantity. The syrup differs in consistency in different countries according to the amount of time employed in boiling, being boiled in Syria so hard that it does not easily run, while in Turkey it is more liquid than sugar-cane molasses. No difference exists on chemical analysis between this latter and grape molasses. It is called in Turkish *pekmez*, in Arabic *dibs*, in Persian and Armenian *rob*, in Greek ἕψημα, and some say, in Hebrew דִּבַשׁ.[1] It is never regarded as a boiled wine or *vincuit*, but as a sweetening syrup. Although in the Persian, the word *pekmez* appears still to signify *wine*.[2] It may sour, but never becomes wine, I am told, on account of the amount of boiling; but just as the acetous fermentation is commencing, it is sometimes converted into brandy. It is sold from two to six cents a quart in the interior; and is to be found at all the grocers in Constantinople, almost as uniformly as molasses would be found in the same shops in America.

The uses of grape molasses are as great as those of sugar and molasses with us; and it supplies their place as the sugar beet and the sweet maple do in some countries, being sold cheaper than any of them. As the Jews had no other sweetening but honey, we must suppose that grape molasses filled the same place with them that it does here at the present day. In cooking various kinds of vegetables with meat for the table, making all kinds of cakes, etc., it is in most frequent and constant use with families of every rank. By some method, a process which I have not seen, fresh grape molasses may be made a solid substance like cake or pudding, without any admixture of anything else. Beaten and stirred up with mustard seed for several days, it becomes a paste of whitish color, which, mixed with water, forms a cooling drink like our ginger, molasses and water.

9. *Simple boiled must*, or *Nardenk*. Simple grape juice without the addition of any earth to neutralize the acidity, is boiled from four to five hours, so as to reduce it to one *fourth* of the quantity put in. The *defrutum* of Pliny was only boiled down to one half, as in No. 7 of this article. The grapes usually chosen are the species naturally

[1] Gesenius's Lexicon.

[2] See Lexicon of Meninski.

sour or such as will not ripen. After the boiling, for preserving it cool and that it may be less liable to ferment, it is put into earthen instead of wooden vessels, closely tied over with skin to exclude the air. Its color is dark; its taste an agreeable sour-sweet; and it is turbid, vegetable gluten being suspended in it, even when it has been standing a long time. It ordinarily has not a particle of intoxicating quality, being used freely by both Mohammedans and Christians. Some which I have had on hand for two years has undergone no change; still when not sufficiently boiled, if exposed to the air and heat, it undergoes a degree of fermentation and becomes exhilarating and perhaps intoxicating. Some large jars of it carried to Odessa from the region where it is principally manufactured, i. e. the southern shores of the Black Sea, fermented on the voyage and the owners paid duty on it as on wine. A friend lately put some water to four inches of the lees in the bottom of a jar, and found in a few days that it had become a sort of wine. *Nardenk* is used as a syrup for a beverage, one part of the syrup to from six to fifteen parts of water. In the Bebek seminary it has been often used by the boys to eat with their bread, as in America we use molasses. Thus Ruth dipped her morsel in some kind of vinegar of wine, Ruth 2: 14. It is sold by all the grocers of Constantinople at the same price or cheaper than wine. However, it is not all made from the grape, but some of it from apples, and some of it from the pomegranate, from whence it originally had its name.

As there has been great search for an unfermented wine—a wine that would not intoxicate—as soon as I came upon the traces two years since of the existence of such an article as Nardenk, I most perseveringly followed it up, till I should find out what it was. For although in the present use of language, an unfermented wine is an impossibility, yet here is a cooling grape liquor which is not intoxicating; and which in the manner of making and preserving it seems to correspond with the recipes and descriptions of certain drinks included by some of the ancients under the appellation "wine." It has never to my knowledge been described by any traveller.

10. *Grape Sugar* or *Boulama.* This article is derived from the boiling of grape juice to make grape molasses. After the lime and ashes has wrought its effect, and the liquor is boiling, the scum which rises to the top is ladled off into other boilers; when a sufficient quantity has been amassed, it is again slightly boiled, cleansed with eggs and poured into barrels for use. In the barrels it appears as a solid, uncrystallized, yellow substance, like paste, of which the surface liquefies in the air; it is cut out for use and sale with a broad knife. It is universally said not to have as much sweetness as the grape molasses or syrup.

It is used very extensively in all the villages south of the Sea of Marmora as an article of food in its simple state, very much as we use pure honey. But besides this, it is almost the only sweetening used by a numerous class of confectioners called Helvagïs, or Sellers of Sweets. There are probably hundreds of shops occupied by the manufacturers of confectionary in Constantinople from this one article of grape sugar. This sugar is by them boiled with pounded sesance, or broken walnuts, or certain roots or starch, and made into solid masses of confectionary or candy that can be cut with a knife or hatchet. Natives and strangers are very fond of eating it with bread at breakfasts and collations, but few strangers are aware of the fact that it is made of this universal grape juice. Each Helvaji consumes probably his thousands of pounds a year of this sugar in his manifold manufactures of sweets for the Turks, who are most passionately fond of all confectioneries.

11. All the *vinegar* of these Eastern lands is made from this same bountiful grape. It is made by pouring water on the grape juice and leaving it to ferment. It is brought to the cities from the grape districts, or made here by the sellers of pickle preserves. Vinegar from sour wine would afford but a small portion of the amount needed in commerce. Of course the Mohammedans have no objection to using vinegar, though it has fermented. But they call "wine," on account of its not having yet reached the acetous fermentation, when its sale is to be tolerated among the Christians, "crude vinegar."

12. *Raisin drink.* Raisins of certain qualities are used in immense quantities for this purpose. They are boiled for two or three hours to make a refreshing drink called "sweet water" (*khoshab*). It is sold by a separate class of tradesmen in Constantinople called *Sherbet* sellers. It has no intoxicating quality, for the proportion of water is large and it is drank only when freshly made. As a specimen of what occurs all over the city, we may mention that every morning a sherbet seller takes his stand at the head of the Bebek landing, to sell what he has prepared over night, ladling out raisins and liquor together, for his street customers to consume both.

13. *Raisin wine.* This wine is always of domestic manufacture. Four parts of warm water by weight to one of raisins are left to soak two days. Then the raisins are taken out, bruised and again put in, till the fermentation has been sufficient. The result is a mild liquor, of exhilarating qualities. It is called in Arabic *Nèbidh*, in distinction from *Khamr*, the name for ordinary fermented wine. Such a preparation can easily be made in America by any persons, from the raisins of commerce. It is often distilled to make brandy.

14. *Wine.* Our catalogue of the products and uses of the vine has already become sufficiently long, before we come to that which has appeared to many to be the chief end and design of the vine, viz. to afford wine. Here also we must say a word or two. All that which is now called wine in the East is as truly wine, as that which is called wine in France. Whether boiled or not, whether sweet or sour, all the known wines are intoxicating. The boiling which the people of certain districts choose to give to their must, for the purpose of securing a wine that will keep better, should not be confounded with the boiling of the same must, for the purpose of making sugar and molasses. In the former case it is boiled perhaps half an hour and not reduced one twentieth in bulk; in the latter case it is reduced more than three fourths in quantity. And hence an "inspissated wine" should never be confounded with inspissated grape juice. The former gives us an intoxicating liquor and the latter a syrup or molasses. We might say the same of the sweet wines, that although by drying the grapes in the sun or by boiling the must, the wine is preserved sweeter than it would otherwise be, such wines are still intoxicating, and some of them extremely so. In some districts the people regard the boiled wines as stronger than the simple fermented ones. Those of Mt. Lebanon are stronger than the majority of the wines of France. As for the sweet wines, though I am assured by Mr. Ladd, formerly a missionary at Cyprus, that the wine of that island is rarely boiled, yet it is notorious in history, that the Knight Templars lost their possession of Cyprus, by the enervating effect of their indulgence in this enchanting, strong and sweet wine, which from them has been called *Commanderia.*

The Greeks in their modern language call wine κρασιον or "mixed," (a word derived from the ancient custom of mixing largely of spices and drugs with wine,) instead of the more classical term οἶνος. Brandy is too dear to mix with wine, but common resin is put in in such abundance into their common wines, as to make them as nauseating to a stranger as a bitter dose of medicine. Whatever language has been used in modern or ancient times, describing certain wines as unintoxicating, should be received with many allowances. If Horace speaks of the "innocentis pocula Lesbii," or if Athenaeus declares that "Surrentina vina caput non tenent," we should interpret the assertions with the same abatements that we would if uttered from the mouth of an Epicurean of our own day in reference to his favorite wines. The language is comparative merely, and means that some of the wines were not as intoxicating as others.

15. *Brandy* is distilled, either directly from the must of good or

rotten grapes, from the mass of pulp and skins remaining after the juice has been pressed out, from the lees of wine, or from wine. It is called *racki* or *arrack* in the languages of the country. Each family in the interior distils its own *raki*, as they make their wine, in their houses.

16. *The leaves and the stocks of the vine.* The stock and roots of the vine are used for fuel. This use is of trivial importance, but we prefer to leave nothing untold, seeing that it is one of the uses spoken of in the Scriptures. "Behold, it is cast into the fire for fuel; the fire devoureth both the ends of it, and the midst of it is burned," Ezek. 15: 4. In countries bare of forests or other trees than the olive, the cuttings of the vine and the roots from old vineyards may supply no despicable portion of fuel. The cuttings of the vine and the leaves are much used for manure to the vineyard, and the leaves for fodder. The leaves are also used as a vegetable, chopped meat and rice being rolled up together in single leaves, and boiled for the table. It makes a very agreeable dish.

17. The vineyard is a resort for relaxation, in the midst of its refreshing verdure. In the heats of summer and autumn, when the wheat harvest has been gathered in, the vineyard is generally the only portion of the country, which remains verdant. The vine being cultivated like low bushes, or trained in festoons, it retains a bright green, cheering to the eye, while all around is parched and sere and desolate. Thither the inhabitants of the vicinity repair to recline, during their hours of rest, in the lodge, the summer house or arbor, refreshing themselves in the contemplation of its widespread verdure, and listening to the murmur of the waters that flow along from perhaps the only spring in the region, while the surrounding air is at the same time made delightfully cool. In Hebron where wine is not made from the grapes, Dr. Robinson observes, "The vintage is a season of hilarity and rejoicing for all; the town is then deserted, and the people live among the vineyards in the lodges and in tents."[1] As the press is often in the vineyard, and thus the pressing of the grapes is carried on there, it as an additional motive to frequent the vineyard. Is. 5: 2.

Connected with this topic we cannot pass over the fact, that the grape vine is much more extensively used for ornament and shade in the East, than the woodbine or ivy in our own country. As one proof of it, we venture to assert that it would probably appear on an accurate calculation, that more than one half of the houses in Con-

[1] Biblical Researches, Vol. II. 442.

stantinople, have at least one vine on the premises, which is trained to grow either on the sides of the house, or across a framework or trellis, for the sake of its verdure, ornamental fruit and shade. The coffee shops and every place of public resort, if they have the smallest open spot, are planted with a grape vine, for the purpose of shade and relief to the eye. A single stem of a vine is sometimes trained along to the distance of forty feet by cutting off the shoots as they appear, till it has reached the spot where its owner wishes to avail himself of its luxuries. We can easily conceive of the delight with which people recline under the green shade of these welcome vines in public places, and the especial delight with which in the heat of summer a man "sits down under his *own* vine," 1 Kings 4: 25. Micah 4: 4.

Among the uses of the grape which we have not enumerated as existing at the present day, is that of pressing the juice from the fresh ripe clusters into vessels to be drank immediately. All persons deny that any such prevailing custom exists, although it is admitted that it is sometimes done for amusement and variety, and for the children of a family. However no evidence that I have seen appealed to of the usages of antiquity would seem to be sufficient to lead us to suppose that it was ever a standing usage. We cannot affirm that the butler of Pharaoh was ever in the habit of performing such an operation. He performed it in a dream, but when he was set at liberty, we simply read that he gave the cup into Pharaoh's hand, Gen. 40: 21. Nor does the language of Greek or Roman poets, when describing the luxury of drinking the "blood of the grape" from its fresh clusters, when treated by the rules of ordinary criticism, imply that the voluptuaries of those days were satisfied with any such abstemiousness. Statues of Bacchus and Bacchanalians have indeed been found, in which the individual is represented as pressing the juice directly from the cluster into a cup. But such a representation may be as much the language of imagination as any poetry, and at any rate little accords with the mythology of the jolly Bacchus, or his revelling followers, who would never drink of grape juice till it was well fermented, that it might better aid them in the enthusiasm of their orgies.

In what we have said, we have purposely avoided direct biblical criticism and controversy, wishing simply by a contribution of facts from an observer in the East, to aid those in the discussion of controverted points, who have more time and ability. Still we would suggest whether this array of facts on the utility of the grape vine will not sustain the idea that the greater part of the praises bestowed upon "wine" as it is translated in our version, are bestowed upon the grape juice as freshly expressed, without bringing into view the specific

forms into which it may afterwards be manufactured. We say only the greater part, but not all, wishing to exclude the places where יַיִן is found. The idea that תִּירוֹשׁ is used in this general sense and not in a specific one, is one that easily presents itself, in seeing that in nearly all the thirty-eight cases where the word occurs, it is in connection with corn and oil, first fruits or offerings; and the idea becomes more confirmed when we see how many and important are the general uses of the grape.

Travellers from northern countries unaccustomed to any product of the grape but wine, whenever they have met with some of these liquid and almost solid products of it, have spoken of them as kinds of wine, as if every liquor of grape must necessarily have that name. Thus Parry states that "the Turks carry with them on their journeys unfermented wine," which we have seen from our descriptions could only be some kind of grape syrup. Dr. Duff of Scotland, travelling in France, misleads his readers in a contrary direction by speaking of wine as mere grape juice. He speaks with delight of his having seen "the peasants carrying along instead of milk, bowls of the pure unadulterated blood of the grape." Now although this was wine, with his old English habits he would feel no prejudice against the use of it, whether in the form of weak claret or strong Madeira.

The blessing on vineyards and the vintage, and on wine-vats that are found in the Bible, are not bestowed simply on account of their yielding wine, but on account of the manifold uses of the grape, supposing wine to be included with the rest. We need not look about for an unintoxicating wine to be enabled to account for these blessings upon it, but to these choice and important products which we have enumerated. We can see from this abundance of products why the vine and its *tirosh* is so much praised, while wine is so generally condemned. In view of the rich supply it afforded for the essential wants of the people of Judea, a clearer and fuller meaning is given to the passage, "As the new wine is found in the cluster, and one saith, Destroy it not; for a blessing is in it," Isa. 65: 8. And we can see how Isaac could bless Jacob with the prayer, "God give thee of the dew of heaven, and the fatness of the earth, and plenty of corn and wine (*tirosh*)," Gen. 27: 28. Well might those who were deprived of all the luxuries we have described, "lament for the fruitful vine," Isa. 32: 12.

ARTICLE V.

REVIEW OF CHASE'S EDITION OF THE APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS.

The work claiming to be the Constitutions of the Holy Apostles, including the Canons; Whiston's Version, revised from the Greek; with a prize Essay at the University of Bonn, upon their Origin and Contents; translated from the German, by Irah Chase, D. D. New-York: D. Appleton & Co. 1844. pp. 496, 8vo. price $2,50.

THE literary progress of our country is marked by the increasing demand for such works as this and Neander's Church History. We hope their sale will amply reward the toil and enterprise of the translators and the publishers.

The present work is elegantly printed and is well executed in all its parts. The Constitutions occupy 257 pages; the prize essay on their contents, date, design, etc., 212; and a separate dissertation on the Canons, by the same author, 26 pages. The last work is the same which was presented to our readers in the Bibliotheca Sacra, Feb., 1847.

The Constitutions are divided into eight books, and each book into many short chapters or sections. That part of the work which is called the Canons, eighty-five in number, constitutes the last chapter, which is much longer than any of the others. These Constitutions are all put forth in the name of one or more of the apostles, and embrace a great variety of matter in regard to morals, the forms of divine worship, the rights and ranks and duties of the clergy, etc. The first sentence is as follows: "The apostles and elders to all those who from among the Gentiles have believed in the Lord Jesus Christ; grace and peace from the Almighty God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, be multiplied to you in the acknowledgment of him."

The first book is entitled, "Concerning the Laity; the second, Concerning Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons; book third, Concerning Widows; book fourth, Concerning Orphans; book fifth, Concerning Martyrs; book sixth, Concerning Schisms; book seventh, Concerning Deportment and the Eucharist and Initiation into Christ; and book eighth, Concerning Gifts and Ordinations and Ecclesiastical Canons."

Book II. c. 11, is as follows: "On this account, therefore, O bish-

op, endeavor to be pure in thine actions, and to adorn thy place and dignity, as sustaining the character of God among men in ruling over all men, over priests, kings, rulers, fathers, children, masters, and in general over all those who are subject to thee; and to sit in the church, when thou speakest, as having authority to judge offenders. For to you, O bishops, it is said, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." The next chapter begins thus: "Do thou, therefore, O bishop, judge with authority, like God; yet receive the penitent."

We select, also, as specimens two or three of the shortest Canons. 7. "Let not a bishop, or a presbyter, or a deacon undertake the cares of this world; but if he do, let him be deposed." 11. "If any one, even privately, pray with a person excommunicated, let him be suspended." 20. "Let a clergyman who becometh surety, be deposed." 55. "If any one of the clergy abuse his bishop, let him be deposed." 69. "If any bishop, or presbyter, or deacon, or reader, or singer, do not keep the holy quadragesimal fast, or do not fast on the fourth day of the week, or on the preparation, let him be deposed, unless he be hindered by weakness of body; but if the offender be a layman, let him be suspended." 53. "If any bishop, or presbyter, or deacon, do not, on festival days, partake of flesh or wine (abominating them, and not for his own exercise) let him be deposed, as *having a seared conscience*, and becoming a scandal to many."

If we find room, we shall be glad to subjoin further specimens; but these may be enough to give some idea of the general character of the Constitutions to those who may need it. We therefore proceed to some remarks which have occurred to us while examining the work.

It is as true as it is paradoxical, that some books, once the most pernicious in their influence, are now among the most salutary;—salutary, too, just in proportion as they were pernicious, and *because* they were pernicious. Stripped of their false guise and convicted of their evil deeds, they become our most trustworthy monitors for all future time. Such, to all Protestant Christendom, is now eminently the fact with the Apostolical Constitutions;—that ancient work of such mysterious origin, but potent and abiding influence. Perhaps neither the time nor the place nor the chief author of this pious fraud, was ever known to more than one man. The secret may have died with the fabricator. Be this, however, as it may, the work itself was early spread; generally if not universally regarded as of apostolical authority; and of course exerted a powerful influence in forming the principles and moulding the institutions of the papal and oriental churches.

The grand moral of the whole complicated production, is twofold, the external unity of the church and the exaltation of her clergy. The first was essential to the highest attainment of the last, though perhaps not so intended by the author. With this general and decided bearing, it is easy to see its influence in preparing the way for prelatical domination. And this influence it would doubtless have continued to exert, with undiminished power in the corrupted churches, had it not been for a further pious fraud, of later date, perpetrated even upon these same Constitutions, by interpolations of an Arian cast. This at length opened the eyes of some of the leaders of the church, and the work was condemned by a council held at Constantinople in 692. From this condemnation, however, the eighty-five Canons, containing most of the prelatical assumptions, were excepted.

Here, by way of counteraction, already appeared some good from one of these frauds. It came, however, too late and was too limited in extent to undo the evil and arrest the tide of usurpation which had so long been flowing and which, on the one hand, was so congenial to human ambition and, on the other, so flattering to the then blinded vision of the best men in the church. For then, indeed, as well as now, good men saw and deplored the evils of prelatical oppression; but strange as it may now seem, instead of removing the source, they were as zealous as the most ambitious prelates themselves for increasing the power of the bishops. From the very origin of these assumptions, in the second or third century, on to their climax under a Hildebrand or an Innocent III., the vain hope was indulged that the *abuse* of power was to be curbed by the erection of a still *higher* power, just as in the delusive dream which has ever beguiled the nations into civil despotism. The process was simply this. First, in order to check discords and abuses among the pastors or bishops of the individual churches, as Jerome suggests, a diocesan was created to preside over and control them. Then, it was found necessary to create an archbishop, to keep the diocesans in order; then a patriarch to curb the archbishop; and finally, a pope, with still greater power, to rule the whole. Till long after all this was done, and much more of the like kind by way of general councils and other devices, even the best and wisest in the church still cherished the delusive hope, that the proper check to an abuse of power, was the erection of a superior power,—not dreaming that the very antidote they prescribed was itself the bane; or rather, insanely imagining, that when they had enthroned a single man as Christ's vicegerent on earth, he would become more like Christ himself in the exercise of unlimited dominion, instead of becoming more like the devil.

Nothing but the fearful experiment of more than a thousand years, could begin to open the eyes of men to this cardinal fallacy. Like honest but desperate empirics, they firmly believed their nostrum a sovereign remedy if it could only be forced down in sufficiently large portions. Their mistake lay in the very nature of sinful man, vainly imagining that there was somewhere a point of elevation in which he would cease to do evil and learn to do well by the removal of personal restraint and by possessing power to restrain others. And right well did the corrupt and ambitious spirits who thus mounted to power, rejoice in this popular delusion—themselves also, perhaps, just as sincerely sharing in the general frenzy and hoping for a final good result to so mad a career. Just as in the case of civil usurpers, there was of course always some hideous dragon, real or imaginary, to be crushed beneath the wheels of their mighty car.

In one sense, this whole process was as needless as it was vile and foolish. Christ had given his disciples the clear outlines of a very different polity, and had expressly warned them against the whole spirit of such a movement. Of course they might have known better. But in another view, we may say, there was a moral necessity for the whole sad experiment. In such a world as this, even good men will never learn by mere precept. Our first parents even, though in their pristine purity, did not abide by God's directions. It is a world of experiments, and every imaginable device must be tried. And, what more natural than that of popery? In such a world, nothing short of experience, and that of the hardest, can restrain or recover the church from human inventions, and bring her to the stable practice of Christ's directions. Happy for us, then (if we will only profit by the result) that so much of this experimenting is already done. But in order that we may profit by it, the history of every experiment should be preserved and carefully studied; if not, then all has been suffered in vain, and must be suffered over again. We must know, not only the general result, but also the causes and the process; in short, the beginning and the middle and the end. Then, and then only, shall we be prepared for a thorough reform; and then only, if already reformed, shall we be effectually guarded from all approaches to the like folly.

It is in view of facts and principles like these, that we may venture to assign so high a rank in present and prospective usefulness, to a work once so pernicious as the stupendous forgery now before us. Though not the prime cause of popery—for that is to be found in the depths of human nature—it was among the earliest and most effective agencies in the organization of all the spiritual despotisms that have

existed in the church. And now like an arch-culprit, in chains on the gibbet, it hangs an everlasting memento to the whole world. The history of the detection and the complete proof of the imposture, are most amply detailed in the very learned treatises which accompany the original documents.

In publishing these Constitutions in a new dress, and in his excellent translation of the accompanying dissertations, Dr. Chase has therefore conferred a lasting obligation on the increasing millions who speak the English language. The work will be needed and will therefore be read wherever this language shall be spoken. If sent to all, as we believe it has already been sent to some, of our missionary stations in Western Asia, it will serve as a remedy for the inveterate maladies so early generated by these very Constitutions.

But while we thus speak of the malignant influence of these Constitutions wherever they were regarded or may still be in part regarded as authentic, it is not to be supposed that they bear, on their face, anything of a malign aspect. Precisely the contrary. Nothing could smile more benignly. In his most infernal deeds, Satan always appears as an angel of light. It is his only hope of success. Nor is it any more to be supposed that the man or the men who forged these Constitutions and palmed them on the world as productions of the apostles, were conscious of any sinister purpose. Their motives throughout, so far as appears from the work itself, were not only pure, but of the most exalted kind, aiming at the salvation of men, the glory of God, the best interests of the church, and the support of what they regarded as sound morality. Often, we have chapter after chapter of the most unobjectionable and salutary matter, and all in an air of the most solemn and dignified earnestness. There is no trifling, and not a great deal which can be called trivial. Compared with the more recent fictions of full-blown superstition, there is everywhere a dignity which the rather befits those very apostles whose names they bear. Hence one among the many proofs, that the authors were men of talents, and of some taste, and no little skill, and that they lived at a pretty early period. At all events, they well understood their art. Compared with the silly things we find in the Koran, in the later fictions of the Papists, or of our own Mormon or Shaker prophets of the present hour, their work is purity and dignity itself.

Nor are the authors of the Constitutions to be convicted of any personally ambitious or sinister designs. If laymen, they were most meek and self-denying in prostrating all laymen in the dust before the priesthood. If clergymen, as most probably they were from their thorough acquaintance with ecclesiastical affairs, they were wide awake

to the self-restricting office of guarding equally the purity of clerical life and against the abuse of clerical power. They would compel themselves, as well as their whole order, to a most holy, meek and self-denying life, to the most sedulous discharge of their sacred functions, to a renunciation of the world and all its pomp, to the practice of the most rigid discipline, and to the most equitable use of all their own large powers and the most humble submission to the still higher authority of their own superiors. As before intimated, their grand fault is not to be found in their purpose, but in the fatally mistaken mode for its execution. They saw as clearly and lamented as sincerely as we do, the abuses of power in their day; but they sought to check its abuse in the many by increasing this power in the few. This was but throwing oil instead of water on the incipient volcano. And here is the grand deception of Satan in this movement, so far as it may be attributed to him. For him thus to lead even good and able men into such an error, may well be pronounced a greater achievement than to impel his own ambitious votaries to avail themselves of these facilities in his service. To make the very angels do his work, and on so great a scale as this proved in the end, is something more than transforming himself into an angel of light.

If deemed too charitable towards the authors of so sacrilegious a forgery, we must say, that our charity is the fruit of a patient consideration of their production, in connection with the circumstances of their age, and is, moreover, at the expense of all our prepossessions. We may also say, that the cause of truth has always something to lose and nothing to gain by unduly imputing wrong motives or a bad character to the authors of even the most pernicious movements. It is itself a kind of pious fraud, and must, sooner or later, recoil on its source. Nay, the very idea, so natural to us, that very bad schemes *must* have originated with bad men, is as fatal to the safety of the church as it is false to her history. It leads her unduly to judge of measures by the religious character of their advocates and not by their intrinsic merits, and thus puts her off her guard, just as in the days of her ancient simplicity, whenever human expedients, of whatever kind, are proposed by men whom she deems eminent saints. Thus does she become prepared, not only to follow blindly in the path of good but imperfect men, but also tamely to resign herself to the dictates of such consummate hypocrites as have the craft and the audacity to palm themselves on her credulity in the garb of sanctity. Even the pope of Rome himself has increased his assumptions and swayed his boundless power over men, partly if not chiefly, by arrogating to himself the appellation of *His Holiness*, and causing himself to be regard-

ed as the very personification of unerring rectitude. And when, by the unutterable wickedness of an Alexander VI. and a Julius II., just before the Reformation, the charm of papal sanctity was broken, a grand impediment was removed to a reform for which the church had been sighing for two hundred years.

It is, then, as much our wisdom as our duty to do full justice to the moral character and purposes of these and all the other early forgers of revered documents, however misguided their policy or baleful their influence.

'But can it be, that *good* men should ever be left to practise such frauds? to palm on the world, in the very name of "The Holy Apostles," what themselves had fabricated? Be their design ever so good, could they think it right to promote their designs by falsehood? and that, too, in so awful a transaction as that of a *religious* forgery? Could they think themselves even doing God service while writing spurious gospels and Apostolical Constitutions to bind the church forever as by divine authority?'—With all our present light, this does indeed seem too atrocious for belief. But this light, when soon lost after the days of the apostles, has been but very slowly regained, and that by small gradations. Even now, the film is not completely purged from all *protestant* eyes—to say nothing of the state of the papal vision. Do not some pious physicians and pious nurses and pious mothers think it right to lie to sick children for their good; and some pious officers in the army to lie to the enemy? And was not Paley a pious man when he advocated these "white lies?" And if good men can now believe it right to lie in order to save the lives of their fellow mortals, why might not good men, in a darker age, think it right to lie to save men's souls? and, if right, why not an incumbent duty? nay, a duty just so much the more imperative as the object was vast and the subject awful? If right in principle, even in the smallest things, the most religious awe, arising from the solemn and stupendous nature of the forgery, instead of deterring, would but impel to the deed. It could only warn the fabricator to a greater scrupulosity in the right performance of his momentous office. He must see to it that what he inculcated was right, a truly *pious* fraud; and then, that it was so fabricated as to surpass the power of detection, and thus do the utmost good to the end of time.

The believer, then, in justifiable lying of any kind, at the present day, is guilty of a gross absurdity while uttering his astonishment at the audacity of those early forgers for applying the same principle to things *so sacred.* It was precisely where it *ought* to be applied, if applied at all. They were the brave men whom he ought rather to

commend for acting up to their principles in transactions so perilous to their own souls as well as the souls of others, if not done in a right manner. But if now, on the other hand, the moral absurdity of lying in regard to things so solemn and sacred, and on so vast a scale, glares most frightfully on his half enlightened vision, let him renounce utterly, in theory as well as practice, all lying in whatever case. Till then, he must at least acknowledge their consistency and his own absurdity.

As a matter of fact, the doctrine of pious frauds had long been taught in the world. Plato had himself inculcated it, though with great restrictions. By his followers, the converted Eclectics, it is supposed to have been fostered if not first brought into the church, in the second century. Tertullian, in his work on baptism, written about the close of that century, sec. 17, speaks of a certain presbyter in Asia who had forged a writing in the name of Paul, and who, on being convicted of the fault, pleaded that he had done it out of love to the apostle, and yielded up his place. From this it is manifest, on the one hand, that such frauds had already been commenced, and, on the other, that they were by no means generally approved; nor, indeed, are we to suppose such a thing ever to have been sanctioned by the church at large, however prevalent both the doctrine and the practice may afterwards have become. A multitude of other spurious works were ere long found in circulation, of which we have a brief but interesting notice, by Dr. Chase, in his preface to the present work.

With such a doctrine afloat and such a practice, however discountenanced by the great body of the church, we need not wonder that some good men should be found guilty of it, especially at a period when many in the church were but half converted from their heathenish practices and principles.

With some, the early existence of so many false gospels and other spurious works, may prove a stumbling block to their faith in the genuineness of any of the early records. Indeed, infidels have not unfrequently urged this point with great vehemence. But it can have force only with the half taught in these matters. A great part of the forgeries were detected at a very early period. And in regard to the rest, it is as surprising as it is delightful to see how the increasing skill of criticism is enabled to detect, not only the forgery, but very nearly the period, if not also the country, in which it was perpetrated. And then, the same skill which detects the false, serves also more completely to verify the true; and thus the result of the whole is, if possible, a more complete proof of the genuineness of the true gospels and epistles than if none had ever been forged.

To see this in a strong light, let any candid and intelligent mind take the important and difficult case of these Apostolical Constitutions, including the Canons. When the reader has gone through with the entire volume now before us, he will hardly fail of being impressed with the magical power of criticism in tracing the long hidden footsteps of imposture, and will doubtless conclude, with the author of the essays, that nearly all the Constitutions except the last book, were written in the last half of the third century and somewhere among the oriental churches; and that a few interpolations, together with the whole of the last book, were added by the hand of some Arian, in the latter part of the fourth century,—the Canons being, however, chiefly a compilation of previous forgeries at different times. We have no space for showing how these results are reached.

But we must add that, important as are the main results, they are but a small part of the benefit to the reader. He is, as it were, carried back to that early period of the church, then in her forming or rather her most deplorably transforming state, and seated in the midst of her worshipping and her deliberative assemblies, there to witness, not only her forms of worship, her singing, her prayers, and the minute regulations of her assemblies, but also those blind though honest efforts for reforming abuses, whereby she plunged succeeding generations into tenfold greater evils. In short, it is only by reading such ancient works as these, and with such helps, that one can become master of the ecclesiastical antiquities of the period. And, for this purpose, it is no objection at all, that the work is a forgery, the moment we have detected its real character and date. For, though a fiction in regard to the past, it was a true picture of the existing and forthcoming realities. And by showing us, in the very germ, many of the corruptions in the church, it is the best possible refutation of the high claims of those hoary abuses, and affords, in the end, the highest proof and the highest commendation of those few and plain and simple rites left us in the New Testament, and likewise of that divinely simple and yet most safe and efficient church polity there sketched. We must also say, that if one would gain his crowning conviction, not only of the genuineness but also of the authenticity of our divine records, we know of no surer way than for him candidly to compare them with any or all the spurious works which have claimed a like origin. Such is the glaring contrast that, while the one class is plainly of the earth, the other is as manifestly from heaven.

But while we see much of the evils and mistakes of the early church in these false writings, we see, so far as quantity is concerned, a vast deal more that is highly commendable. There is everywhere, as be-

fore intimated, the same solemn and earnest spirit as in her authentic history; and even in her fictions we should, if we would do her justice, always remember her good intentions; and thus, instead of utterly scorning her person, we shall rather commiserate her disadvantages, and sympathize in those bloody struggles in which she was, at that very period, so gloriously preserving for us the rich legacy bequeathed by our common Lord.

Before closing our remarks we must say, that the translations appear to have been made with skill and fidelity. We have, to some extent, compared the version of the Constitutions with the original Greek, and that of the Essay with the German. Krabbe's shorter Dissertation, which was written in Latin, we have not compared, but have no reason to suspect the fidelity of the translation, while here the English diction is decidedly superior to what we find in the translation of the Essay. This difference may be attributed to the peculiar difficulty of rendering modern German into good English, as both productions are from the same pen and on the same general subject, and both translated by the same hand. So far as diction is concerned, the task of translating is always incomparably more difficult than that of original composition. But in translating German, there seems to be this strange and singular fatality, that the more one is versed in the language and enamored with its forms, the less is he capacitated for writing pure English. Thus an accomplished German scholar may unwittingly speak of his endeavors to *render* a faithful version, or may thank a friend for his invaluable assistance in *overlooking* the proof-sheets. The many and close analogies between the two languages, gradually blinds him to the points of difference, and he unconsciously falls into *Germanisms*, both in the use of terms and the structure of sentences. *Uebersehen*, for example, means *to look over* as well as *to overlook*, and is composed of a preposition and a verb, just like our word *overlook;* and from such close analogies the student of German forgets the slight variations and thus gradually loses his native idiom. Soo, too, in regard to the import of single words. For instance, *Bewusstseyn*, defined in the dictionaries as meaning *consciousness*, is now very often employed in quite a different sense, and might just about as well be represented by *abracadabra* as by our word *consciousness*. And yet it is indiscriminately rendered by this word in some of our best translations, and the mere English reader is often left to divine the meaning, as best he can, from the connection. If the translator himself cannot divine its meaning or cannot give that meaning in English without a most tedious paraphrase, as may sometimes be the fact, it would be better to transfer the uncouth word itself than to put the

reader on a false scent in quest of its import. Why a like infirmity does not cleave to our scholars when translating from Latin or Greek, is a question of some interest, but we will not enter further on it here.

In the translations before us from the Latin and the Greek, we have noticed no violations of good English either in the use of words or the structure of sentences, while in that from the German, our attention has been frequently arrested by the German tinge in both these respects. Some instances of the kind will be found in the following criticism, by Dr. Krabbe, on the first epistle of Clement of Rome, who was contemporary with the apostles, and to whom the writing of the Constitutions as given by the apostles, was anciently ascribed. The paragraph is worth the reader's attention for higher purposes than that of verbal criticism on the translation.

"In modern times, the genuineness of this first epistle, as a whole, has generally been acknowledged. Still we cannot pronounce it free from considerable interpolations. It seems to be equally unworthy of Clement, and of the whole apostolical simplicity of his letter, if he, from the fable of the bird Phoenix (Ep. I. c. 25 and c. 26), should wish to illustrate the possibility of the resurrection from the dead. Much rather can we hold this narrative to be an interpolation which belongs to a later age, in which the Christian *consciousness* [Bewusstseyn] had receded, and men were pleased with such argumentations. The conjecture also might not be too adventurous to place these and similar interpolations in the age of our Constitutions. At least, the same account of the bird Phoenix is found also in our Constitutions; and if there is a difference in the account, it is not an essential one. In the epistle to the Corinthians, Clement relates that this bird dies in Arabia; but our Constitutions (V. 7), that it builds itself a funeral pile in Egypt, and consumes itself by fire. On the contrary, the agreement in the cited passage of the Constitutions is very essential, since the account of the bird Phoenix is also here mentioned as presenting a case analogous to the resurrection of men, and as being an account from which also the heathen had argued. Once more; the passage in c. 40, is very much to be suspected, because it transfers the whole Jewish priesthood into the Christian church; while, in the other parts of the letter, the simple relations of the apostolic age prevail, and Clement sets bishops and presbyters or elders on a level, and uses these titles interchangeably. See c. 42 and 44. Here also the same interpolator could [may] have been busy, who composed the Constitutions, and transferred into them the whole Levitical system of priests. This first epistle to the Corinthians might [may], as for

the rest, be [have been] the only genuine document which has come to us, from the historical [real] Clement." p. 346.

We have spoken the more freely on this matter of Germanized English, because we think our language is seriously suffering from this source, in the hands of some of our theological writers, just as it suffered, an age or two ago, from popular essayists who were enamored with French modes and idioms. The present evil, however, has arisen perhaps still more from a fondness for German terminology in philosophy, than from our numerous translations of German authors. We ought also to say, that the foregoing specimen from Dr. Chase is by no means a fair sample of his style; for generally, even when translating from the German, his language is pure and correct; and the reader is, moreover, under great obligations to him for the pains he has taken in breaking up and disentangling the long and complicated sentences of his author.

There is also another and more serious topic on which we must be allowed to remark, lest our silence should be regarded as implying assent. After mentioning the fact that pedobaptism is commended in the Constitutions, Prof. Krabbe says, p. 410: "This is altogether in harmony with the view which, already, we have often indicated in respect to the time of the Constitutions. It is ascertained that pedobaptism does not belong to the apostolic age; and it is difficult to point out its existence before the time of Tertullian, who zealously opposed it. In his time, this practice seems to have been first coming into existence; for the passages in Irenaeus,[1] and in Clement of Alexandria, will hardly bear criticism, and can prove the contrary of that for which they have sometimes been adduced. But after the time of Tertullian, it was rapidly introduced, and about the middle and towards the end of the third century, it was received in the Alexandrian and North African church, and only there.[2] Still there were at that time

[1] Neander says, that "Irenaeus is the first church teacher in whom we find any allusion to infant baptism," and thinks "it is difficult to conceive how the term regeneration," as applied to infants in the passage from Irenaeus, "can denote anything else than baptism." Of course he thinks the passage *will bear criticism*, though he agrees with Krabbe in his general position, that pedobaptism was introduced into the church at *some* period after the apostles, but when or how or by whom, neither he nor any other writer has told us. See Neander's Church History, translated by Torrey, I. 311.

[2] Neander thinks otherwise, and that it was then practised in Persia, where it can hardly be supposed to have recently spread from Africa. "In the Persian church, infant baptism was, in the course of the third century, so generally recognized that the sect founder Manes thought he could draw an argument from it in favor of a doctrine which seemed to him necessarily presupposed by this applica-

those who, viewing baptism as an *opus operatum*, expected from it a mysterious and magical forgiveness of sins, and therefore deferred it as long as possible. Against these, now, our Constitutions speak most decidedly and warn them not to put off conversion to the hour of death."

The fact that the Constitutions reprobate the practice of postponing baptism to the hour of death, is indeed good proof that they were not composed till after the existence of this culpable practice, which cannot be traced back beyond the age of Tertullian whose doctrine, as we shall soon see, led most directly to the practice. But Prof. K. goes further than this, and seems to suppose that their injunction of *infant* baptism at all, is a proof of their origin in the latter part of the third century. "It is ascertained," says he, "that pedobaptism does not belong to the apostolic age." This is a pretty strong assertion on a question so long and so strenuously disputed. But the author does not tell how or by whom the *biblical* argument for pedobaptism has been "ascertained" to be worthless. He and Gieseler and some other German writers of distinction, first *assume* this fact as proved; and then they proceed to search in the uninspired records of the church, for the origin of the institution, as though it *must* have arisen after the apostles. And the first indubitable trace they can find of it, is in the passage in Tertullian's noted work on Baptism, about the year 200; a work designed neither to support nor to deny infant baptism, but to crush "a certain most venomous serpent of the heresy of the Cainites, lately dwelling in these parts,—that most monstrous woman Quintilla, who had not the right to teach even pure doctrine," and who had begun with denying *all* baptism.

We have here no room for discussing at large the early history of pedobaptism; but, as this single passage of Tertullian is the chief testimony referred to by our author and other German writers whom we have read on the same side, we think it proper to quote the passage, and thus give our readers an opportunity to judge for themselves of its bearing on the main question.

But we must first state most distinctly what the main question is; for by losing sight of this, we are liable to pervert his testimony. Prof. K. says, that 'it is difficult to point out the existence of pedo-

---

tion of the rite." See Neander's Ch. Hist. I. 314. Manes was put to death by the Persian king in 277. As he wrote in the Syriac language, he would not be likely to argue from a custom not admitted by the Christians who spoke that language, and therefore the *Syrian* as well as the Persian church may be regarded as then *practising* the rite. And as he resided for a while in India, and even travelled to China, after appearing as a Christian teacher, he must have been extensively acquainted with the Christian rites as practised in the East.

baptism before the time of Tertullian, *who zealously opposed it.*' True enough, he did oppose it with all zeal, as the reader will soon see. But the question is not, whether he *opposed* pedobaptism, but in what *sense* did he oppose it? and on what *grounds?* Was it because *wrong* and *unlawful* in itself? Or was it only on the ground of a decided *inexpediency* in most cases? If the former, then his testimony is against the rite itself; if the latter, it is impliedly but just as decisively in its favor. And if the former, so laconic a writer can give his testimony in a word; if the latter, he may deign to reason a little in support of it, especially if in favor of a position entirely new and opposed to the established custom. With these needful remarks as to the question itself, we present his testimony, as translated by Dodgson and printed in the Library of the Fathers.

"But they, to whom the office belongeth, know that baptism must not be rashly entrusted. In every petition there may be both deceit and self-deception. Wherefore the delaying of baptism is more profitable according to the condition, and disposition, and moreover the age of each person, but especially in the case of children. For why is it necessary, if the thing be not so necessary,[1] that the sponsors also be brought into danger? For both they themselves may, from their mortal nature, fail of their promises, and they may be disappointed by the growing up of a bad disposition. The Lord indeed saith, Forbid them not to come unto me. Let them come when they are of riper years; let them come when they are disciples, when they are taught

[1] *Si non tam necesse est;* if *it* be not so necessary. This is the more exact rendering, and also preserves more exactly a strong Shakespearian element of style everywhere found in the writings of the terse, abrupt, antithetic and obscure Tertullian. Perhaps it was on account of its obscurity that it has ever been omitted in the text of Tertullian. Dodgson has restored it; but does not tell us why or on what authority, or whether himself understands it. But, for both its import and its pertinency, we have only to advert to what Tertullian had just said, in the preceding section, on the necessity for even a layman's baptizing, in case of extreme danger of death. "For then is a boldness, in him that aideth, admissible, when the case of him that is in danger, is urgent. For he will be guilty of destroying a man, if he shall forbear to do that for him which he had free power to do." A necessity arising from the danger of death, is then the necessity spoken of in the parenthetic clause, and which was to create an exception to Tertullian's general rule. His meaning is simply this: 'Why is it necessary for the sponsors to incur this peril, provided it be not such a case of life and death as I have just mentioned?'

The clause is exactly one which an ignorant or unreflecting transcriber would be apt to omit, but which no man would be likely to foist into the text; and the whole manner is so much like that of Tertullian as to bear *prima facie* evidence of its genuineness. And if genuine, it casts additional light on Tertullian's views of the *lawfulness* of infant baptism.

whither they are coming; let them become Christians when they are able to know Christ. Why is the age of innocence in haste for the remission of sins? Men will act more cautiously in worldly matters, so that to one, to whom no earthly substance is committed, that which is divine is committed![1] Let them know how to ask for salvation, that thou mayest seem to give to him that asketh. With no less reason unmarried persons also should be put off, within whom temptation is already prepared, as well in virgins by reason of their riper age, as in widows by reason of their wandering about, until they either marry or be confirmed in continency. *They that understand the weighty nature of baptism will fear its attainment rather than its postponement. Faith unimpaired is assured of salvation.*" De Bap. c. 18.

We think so terse and uncompromising a polemic as Tertullian would not have wasted half these words in dissuading from the then obvious custom of pedobaptism, provided he thought the custom itself unlawful. He would have said so at once, and passed to other matters. But, instead of even saying it all, he only urges prudential considerations against needless haste in this matter, just as also in the case of all unmarried persons. And then, in the last two sentences, which we have put in italics, he assigns the grand reason for this delay. And it embodies precisely the reason mentioned by Prof. K. that *opus operatum*, that "mysterious and magical forgiveness of sins," expected from baptism in the third century, "which led men to defer it as long as possible." This was obviously Tertullian's doctrine. Such, in his view, was "the weighty nature of baptism," that they who had once received it must keep "the faith unimpaired" by sin, if they would be sure of salvation. Hence was it such presumption to have it administered to infants or to unmarried persons,—unless in danger of death. And we make this exception, not merely because of the general tenor of his argument, but also because, in the preceding section, he had taught, that even a layman ought to baptize in a case of extreme danger, and that he would be even guilty of destroying the person by refusing to do it. And that this extended to infants as well as others, is further obvious from his belief in original sin, and that all sin is to be washed away by baptism.

But it is enough for our present purpose thus briefly to have placed before our readers the noted passage so often alleged against pedobaptism. Were we discussing the whole question of its early history, we think it might be shown that all the earlier as well as the later

[1] Tertullian regarded the benefit conferred by baptism in the light of a divine treasure which might be lost, like any other treasure, by a heedless child, or thrown away by a wanton youth.

testimony that is at all relevant, goes only to establish the practice, and that the *lawfulness* of pedobaptism was never then called in question by any but those who, like the female preacher whom Tertullian so fiercely assailed, denied *all* water baptism.

Though Tertullian, in the passage above cited, seems to think, that only a faith *unimpaired* can assure salvation, yet, in his work on Penitence, where he treats the subject much more at large, he says, c. 7, that an offender may once, by repentance and confession, "but only for once, and never again," regain what he acquired by baptism. After he became a Montanist, he denied the possibility of any restoration after the first lapse into sin.

It was obviously from such views of "the weighty nature of baptism," and the peril of losing what it was supposed to confer, that Tertullian and many others judged it expedient to defer the rite, not only in the case of infants but also of other persons who might be peculiarly exposed to temptation;—and thus the emperor Constantine, at a subsequent period, deferred his own baptism almost to the very hour of his death, some twenty years after his complete conversion to Christianity. Indeed, so far did some carry this matter, even in the days of Tertullian, that he charged them with pleading a license for sinning and for postponing repentance, *because* not as yet baptized. De Poenit. 6. And Neander, speaking of the same period and the same view of the power of baptism, says, "Hence it was, that many who meant to embrace Christianity, delayed their baptism for a long time, that they might meanwhile surrender themselves without disturbance to their pleasures, hoping to be made quite pure at last by the rite of baptism." Ch. Hist. I. 252.

It was our intention to subjoin some further extracts from the Constitutions, and especially from that portion which confers the most extravagant prerogatives on the clergy. But our limits forbid; and we close by again commending the whole work to all who would gain a thorough knowledge of the early history of the church.

R. E.

ARTICLE VI.

INTERPRETATION OF PSALM LXVIII.

By Wm. W. Turner, Hebrew Instructor in the Union Theol Sem., New York.

Introduction.

The sixty-eighth Psalm is acknowledged by commentators to exhibit an extraordinary degree of lyric force, variety, and beauty; but at the same time, owing to these and to other circumstances, its interpretation presents more and greater difficulties than that of any other piece in the entire collection. A great deal has been accomplished for the elucidation of this noble ode since the time of Michaelis, who broke off at the seventeenth verse, declaring that the thread of connection had slipped from his hands and all was dark before him;[1] yet much still remains to be done before all its rough places can be made smooth. The following may be assumed as some of the general principles which should guide the writer who wishes to carry forward this investigation.

Where a doubt may reasonably exist as to which of two or more explanations of a word or phrase is the best, the interpreter should place them together before the reader and state his reasons for preferring the one which he has concluded to adopt. If he thinks he can offer something better than what has been proposed before, he should not hesitate to do so. But there are two errors of frequent occurrence in writings of this nature which he should carefully endeavor to avoid. While he manifests his respect for the genius and labors of his predecessors by accrediting, as far as practicable, each valuable explanation to its original author, he should disdain the cheap triumphs to be gained by elaborately confuting their palpable mistakes. Again, a profound regard for truth, while it incites him to spare no labor in investigating and weighing every particular that may promise to throw additional light on the subject of his researches, should cause him to keep a jealous guard against that natural vanity which prompts many to attach an undue and even exclusive value to their own conjectures, though they may have nothing but their novelty to recommend them.

---

[1] Epimetra ad Lowthii Prælectiones.

Another rule which the interpreter in the present state of biblical criticism should adopt, is that of a close adherence to the Masoretic text. That this text is wholly free from errors, no honest and well informed critic will assert; nevertheless the absurdity of setting up the authority of the Septuagint or any other version in opposition to it as a whole, has been too well exposed to be now entertained for a moment. The period no doubt will arrive, when the discovery of ante-Masoretic manuscripts or the collation and classification of manuscripts already known, will render possible a systematic revision of the standard Hebrew text; but at present, alterations of it, whether in accordance with ancient versions or by conjecture, except in a few palpable cases of error, are merely labor thrown away. It is time this fact was more generally acknowledged, when we see commentator after commentator rejecting the emendations of his predecessor, often with expressions of contempt, yet venturing on new conjectures of his own, which a like fate quickly overtakes.

There is still another duty imposed on the interpreter who writes in the English language by the existence of the Authorized Version. Of this version many things have been said which are true, many which are absolutely false. It is true that it is the joint and careful production of many admirable scholars profoundly skilled in the Hebrew and English languages, and familiar with the works both of Jews and Christians who had labored in the field of biblical interpretation before them; it is true that the nervous Saxon English in which they have clothed the thoughts of the Hebrew bards and prophets may well be regarded as a miracle of beauty and fitness, and forms a style which, on account of its intrinsic excellence and of the hallowed associations conferred upon it by time, no modern translator can depart from with impunity. But it is not true that this is the best version extant, or that it does not require very great and essential improvements both in matter and in form to raise it to a level with the philological science of the present day. This however is not the place to discuss its imperfections, or to analyze the motives of those who cast stumbling-blocks in the way of their removal; all I wish to say at present is that, in view of the facts here stated, it seems incumbent upon one who offers a new English translation of any portion of Scripture to adopt as his model the style of the Authorized Version, and where he deviates from it to point out his reasons for so doing. Every portion of Scripture thus explained will form a useful contribution to an improved English version to be prepared at a future day.

The principles here laid down I have endeavored to adhere to in the following translation and commentary, with what success the rea-

der will decide. Here follows a list of the works chiefly made use of; a few others which I would gladly have consulted were not at hand.

The Septuagint, Vulgate, Chaldee, and Syriac versions in Walton's Polyglott.

The commentaries of Jarchi, Aben Ezra, and D. Kimchi in the Rabbinical Bible and elsewhere; and of Saadiah in Ewald's Jüdische Sprachgelehrte. *Stuttgart*, 1844.

R. Lowth de Sacra Poesi Hebræorum Prælectiones, cum notis et epimetris J. D. Michaelis, ed. E. F. C. Rosenmüller. *Leipsic*, 1815.

C. F. Schnurrer, Dissertationes Philologico-criticæ. *Gotha*, 1790.

Mendelssohn's translation with the commentary of Joel Bril, etc. *Prague*, 1835.

E. F. C. Rosenmüller, Scholia in Psalmos in compendium redacta. *Leipsic*, 1831.

Böttcher's Proben alttestamentlicher Schrifterklärung. *Leipsic*, 1833.

Ewald's Poetische Bücher des alten Bundes. *Gottingen*, 1835—39.

De Wette's Commentar über die Psalmen, nebst beigefügter Uebersetzung, 4th edit. *Heidelberg*, 1836.

Sachs's translation in the Bibel für Israeliten. *Berlin*, 1838.

Lengerke, die fünf Bücher der Psalmen. *Konigsberg*, 1847.

Argument.

The first circumstance which attracts attention when we try to ascertain the general import of this psalm, is the resemblances between it and the Song of Deborah and Barak. These make it evident that either one has in some respects imitated the other, or both have drawn from some common source. As to the latter supposition, it may be sufficient to say that there is no such common source extant. If a standard sacred poem of such merit and celebrity as to be imitated by writers so far apart had ever existed, it is certainly possible but not probable that it would have been excluded from the extant collection and allowed to perish. We may then safely conclude, until the contrary can be proved, that one of these compositions, to wit Judges 5th and Psalm 68th, imitates the other; and all that remains is to settle the question of priority. Whatever may be the precise age of the psalm, it is undeniably of a later date than the times of the Judges. Now Dr. Robinson, in his exposition of the Song of Deborah, has satisfactorily shown that that poem is coëval with the events it celebrates.[1] It may therefore be considered as established, as far perhaps as such matters admit of being established, that Judges 5th is both anterior in point of time and has served in many respects as a model to the author of the present psalm. The resemblances alluded to will be fully described in the notes.

[1] Bibl. Repository, Vol. I. 1831. p. 575 sqq. The same conclusion is come to by Kemink in his Commentatio de Carmine Deboræ. *Utrecht*, 1840. pp. 24–26.

This being premised, let us ask ourselves, What is the occasion which this psalm celebrates? That it is the bringing of the ark to Jerusalem and the depositing of it there, all commentators may be said to be agreed; they differ only as to whether the particular occasion was its first entry into the sanctuary there erected, or its return after a battle with a foreign enemy. Now that the latter was the case is very clear, as well from the imitations which the psalm contains of the triumphant Song of Deborah as from the entire purport of its contents; for, to use the words of the judicious De Wette, "Why is there so much said of victory, of the destruction of enemies, of the bringing home of captives, of assistance received, if the occasion was not a victory?"

The point of view then at which we must place ourselves for the proper understanding of this composition, is to suppose that the people have just returned after a battle in triumphant procession to Jerusalem bearing the ark in the van, that they have deposited it in its place in the sanctuary, and that they now sing this ode written to celebrate the event. The general course of the argument, leaving particulars for the notes, may be summed up as follows.

I. Allusion to the late going forth to battle with the ark. God leads his people against their enemies, and defeats them, and thus gives the righteous new cause to exult in his protection.

II. Allusion to the triumphant return. Sing praises to Jehovah who prospers his humble worshippers, but makes desolate those that rebel against him.

III. Of this an illustrious example was afforded, when God conducted his people through the wilderness, supplying all their wants;

IV. And finally enabled them to subdue the savage inhabitants of Canaan.

V. And whereas God formerly appeared unto his people on Sinai, so now he has taken up his abode among them on Zion, whither he has just returned leading captive the foes of himself and people.

VI. Thanks be to God, whose care is constantly over Israel, and who will one day enable them to execute plenary vengeance on all their enemies.

VII. These have gazed with envy while beholding the recent procession of the victorious tribes, as they marched with songs and rejoicings to the sanctuary.

VIII. May this new instance of God's goodness enhance his honor and glory among men; so that all nations, even the most remote, may submit themselves to his rightful sway.

IX. Let all the earth praise the glorious God of Israel.

This division into stanzas, which I have taken the liberty of numbering to facilitate reference, is clearly justified by the internal structure of the psalm. Its correctness too is strongly vouched for by the fact that in all essential particulars it is acquiesced in by such widely differing authorities as Mendelssohn, Böttcher, Ewald, De Wette, and Lengerke. If we further examine the relation of these stanzas to each other, it will appear that they may be divided with a good degree of probability

into four pairs of strophe and antistrophe with a concluding epode. We might suppose too that the strophes (stanzas I. III. V. VII.) were sung by the warriors and people, the antistrophes (stanzas II. IV. VI. VIII.) by the priests, and the epode (stanza IX.) by both parties conjointly. Too little however is known of the details of the ancient temple worship to give this supposition any force beyond that of mere conjecture; much less is there any good reason to think that this psalm was sung *during* a procession either *to* the temple (so Schnurrer, Ewald, and others) or *in* the temple (so Lengerke).

Translation.

PSALM LXVIII.

1 For the Leader; by David. A Psalm to be sung.

I.

2 Let God arise, let his enemies scatter;
And let his haters flee before him.
3 As smoke is driven, so drive them away;
As wax is melted before the fire,
So perish the wicked before God.
4 Then shall the righteous be glad and exult before God;
Yea they shall rejoice with gladness.

II.

5 Sing unto God, sing praises to his name;
Prepare the way for him that rideth through the deserts,
Whose name is Jah, and exult before him.
6 The orphan's father and the widow's judge
(Is) God in his holy habitation.
7 God maketh the solitary to dwell in a home,
He bringeth out captives into prosperity;
But rebels inhabit a barren land.

III.

8 O God, when thou wentest forth before thy people,
When thou didst march through the wilderness;
9 The earth trembled, yea the heavens dropped before God,
Sinai itself (shook) before God, the God of Israel.
10 Thou scatteredst bounteous rain, O God;
Thou sustainedst thy possession when they were wearied.
11 Thy wild beasts dwelt therein;
Thou didst prepare in thy good land for the meek, O God.

IV.

12 The Lord gave the word;
The singers of victory were a great army:
13 "Kings of armies flee, they flee;
And she that tarrieth at home divideth the spoil!
14. When ye lie down among the folds,
The wings of the dove shall be covered with silver,
And her pinions with greenish gold."
15 When the Almighty scattered kings therein,
It grew snow-white on Zalmon.

V.

16 A mountain of God is the mountain of Bashan,
A mountain of crags is the mountain of Bashan.
17 Why do ye lower, ye craggy mountains,
At the mount where God hath fixed his abode,
Yea Jehovah reigneth for ever?
18 The chariots of God are twice ten thousand,
Thousands upon thousands!
The Lord is among them, and Sinai in the sanctuary.
19 Thou hast ascended the height, thou hast captured thy foes,
Thou hast received gifts of men,
Yea even rebels, to reign as Jehovah and God.

VI.

20 Blessed be the Lord, who daily beareth us;
The God (who) is our salvation.
21 This God is ours, a God of salvation;
And unto Jehovah the Lord (belong) the issues from death.
22 But God shall dash in pieces the head of his enemies,
The hairy crown of him that goeth on in his trespasses.
23 Saith the Lord: "From Bashan I will bring (them) back,
I will bring (them) back from the depths of the sea;
24 That thou mayest dash thy foot in blood,
That the tongue of thy dogs (may have) its portion of (thine) enemies."

VII.

25 They have seen thy procession, O God;
The procession of my God, my King, to the sanctuary.
26 The singers went before, afterwards the players;
In the midst of damsels beating timbrels.—

27 In the congregations bless ye God:
(Bless) the Lord, ye of the fountain of Israel!—
28 There is little Benjamin, their subduer;
The princes of Judah that o'erwhelmed them with stones;
The princes of Zebulon, the princes of Naphtali.

VIII.

29 Thy God hath ordained thy glory;
Be thou glorious, O God, who hast wrought for us.
30 At thy temple above Jerusalem,
To thee let kings bring tribute.
31 Rebuke the beast of the reeds—
The herd of the bulls with the calves of the nations—
That humbleth himself for pieces of silver;
Scatter thou the nations that delight in war!
32 Let magnates come out of Egypt,
Let Ethiopia quickly stretch forth her hands to God.

IX.

33 Ye kingdoms of the earth, sing unto God,
Sing praises unto the Lord;
34 To him who rideth on the heavens, the heavens of old;
Lo, he uttereth his voice, a mighty voice!
35 Give glory unto God;
Whose majesty is over Israel,
And his glory in the clouds.
36 Fearful art thou, O God, in thy sanctuaries.
The God of Israel giveth glory and strength to his people;
Blessed be God!

Comment.

VERSE 2. This is the invocation, altered from the 2d to the 3d person, which Moses used to employ when the ark was taken up for removal to another encampment; see Num. 10: 35. The hortatory rendering of the old interpreters, *Let God arise*, etc. is therefore more natural and better suited to the energetic character of the entire psalm than the mere declaration, *God arises*, etc. of Ewald, De Wette, and others. The poet transports himself back in imagination to the time when the army was setting out on its expedition, and speaks accordingly.

These two first stanzas have reference to the recent victory. The beginning of the first alludes to the going forth of the ark to the battle-field, and that of the second to its triumphant return, as Böttcher has pointed out; the other verses are general in their nature and contain ideas which form a natural sequence to these two (the 2d and 5th). It will be observed that the ark, as the peculiar seat of God's presence, is spoken of throughout this psalm in the same terms as God himself; see verses 2, 5, 8, 18, 19, 25.

Verse 3. This verse and the next are a poetical amplification of the preceding one (Schnurrer).—*So perish*, etc. When a clause of the parallel is subdivided into two parts, I will indent the latter half as in this case.

Verse 4. Observe that the word rendered simply *before*, is in verses 2 and 3, מִפְּנֵי lit. *from the face of*, i. e. from the presence of, from in front of; and in this verse, לִפְנֵי *at the face of*, i. e. in the presence of; and so v. 5, etc.

Verse 5. The principal interpretations of the second clause may be represented thus:

Extol him who rideth on the clouds.—*Syr. Chald. Saadiah, Eng. Vers., etc.*
Cast up (a way) for him who rideth on the clouds.—*Sept. Vulg. Mendels.*
Cast up (a way) for him who rideth through the plains.—*Schnurrer, Böttcher, De Wette.*

These interpretations, it will be perceived, rest on two different renderings of each of the words סֹלְלוּ and עֲרָבוֹת. Many arguments have been adduced in support of each of them; but a sufficiently conclusive evidence in favor of the last one is, that both words occur repeatedly in the senses it assigns to them, and never in any other.

Prepare the way. The literal meaning of the verb סָלַל *is to cast up*, scil. the earth in constructing a causeway; and it is usually followed by a word meaning *causeway, road*, etc., which here by an elegant ellipsis is omitted; comp. Is. 57: 14. 62: 10. I know not how to imitate this in English, for want of a verb with a similar technical meaning; The Septuagint version has best expressed it by the compound ὁδοποιήσατε. The expression evidently has reference to the ancient custom of constructing roads for the advance of kings and their armies, before great and permanent highways were as common as they have since become.

The great central valley of Palestine, which runs from north to south through its whole length, bounded by a mountain range on either side, is an arid waste except where rendered luxuriantly fertile by the waters of the Jordan and its tributaries.[1] Accordingly it is

[1] Josephus, Jewish Wars 3. 8. Robinson, Bibl. Researches, II. p. 576.

named in Hebrew הָעֲרָבָה *the Arabah*, or *desert plain* κατ' ἐξοχήν; while to portions of it north of the Dead Sea we find applied the names עַרְבוֹת יְרֵחוֹ *the plains of Jericho*, עַרְבוֹת מוֹאָב *the plains of Moab* (see Ges. Lex. ad voc.), perhaps so called in the plural because broken up into a number of small wastes by intervening patches of cultivated land. The absolute term הָעֲרָבוֹת will then naturally designate the valley of the Jordan; and in so understanding it here, we are confirmed by subsequent allusions, verses 16 and 31.

Verse 6. *The widow's judge*, i. e. he that sees justice done to widows. As De Wette has well remarked, we are not to make too special an application of the expressions contained in this and the following verse, where, in conformity with poetic usage, particular images are brought before the mind to indicate in the most forcible manner the different treatment which God bestows on his people and on their enemies.—מְכוֹן קָדְשׁוֹ *his holy habitation.* This phrase is found only in the later writings, in Deut. 26: 15. 2 Chron. 30: 27. Jer. 25: 30. Zech. 2: 17; and it everywhere denotes the heavens. There is in these two verses, as Aben Ezra has pointed out, a beautiful antithesis between the almighty Sovereign of the universe whose seat is in the lofty heavens, and the most feeble and forlorn of his creatures on earth (here representing the nation of Israel in general; see remarks on v. 11), who are the constant subjects of his condescending care; comp. Ps. 11: 4, 5. 138: 6. 146: 5–10.

Verse 7. Lit. *God maketh those who are solitary to dwell at home*, i. e. he makes those who are lonely, forlorn, to live in houses, dwellings of their own; a figure probably suggested by the use of the phrase "his holy *habitation*," in the preceding verse. — בַּכּוֹשָׁרוֹת. There are two modes of rendering and construing this word which are deserving of notice. One is to construe it with אֲסִירִים *captives*, and translate *in fetters*, comparing קְשָׁרִים *belts;* and so Aben Ezra, D. Kimchi, Mendelssohn, and the English Version. The other is to construe with מוֹצִיא *who bringeth forth*, and render *into prosperity;* and so Syr., Saadiah, Ros., Ges., De Wette. The last is decidedly entitled to the preference; because it forms a proper antithesis to the word צְחִיחָה in the next clause, and, which is more conclusive, it agrees with the signification of the verb and its other derivatives. With De Wette I understand this verse like the preceding one in a general sense, but yet as containing an allusion to the removal of the Israelites from Egypt into the promised land, and thus forming a natural transition to what follows. So Rosenmüller: "Haud obscura allusio ad nobilem illam rerum conversionem, qua olim gens Israelitica, summi Dei beneficio, ab Ægyptiaca servitute esset liberata, inque

terram bonis omnibus abundantissimam deducta, barbaris incolis partim deletis, partim e patria in loca vasta atque horrida ejectis."

Verse 8. Here the psalmist, in accordance with a very common practice of the Hebrew poets, when returning thanks in the name of the nation for favors just received or soliciting new ones, introduces a retrospect of the signal manifestations of God's providence on behalf of his people in former times, and especially of that memorable epoch in the nation's history, its exodus from Egyptian bondage and induction into the promised land. Observe that the verbs are here in the past tense, and that the entire stanza has an historical character different from the preceding ones, in which all is vividly depicted as present. Compare too the Song of Deborah and Barak, Judg. v. There verses 2 and 3 form an introduction relating to the recent victory, and invoking blessings on its almighty Author; and these are followed, in verses 4 and 5, by a description of God's appearance on Sinai as the future guide and guardian of his people. This plan our psalmist has closely followed, employing however such additional richness of imagery as to convert the four verses of the older poem into as many stanzas. But that we may arrive at a more precise idea of the relation of these two compositions to each other, it may be well to compare the two passages which exhibit the closest resemblances in detail. In Judg. 5: 4, 5 we read as follows:

4 יְהוָה בְּצֵאתְךָ מִשֵּׂעִיר
בְּצַעְדְּךָ מִשְׂדֵי אֱדוֹם
אֶרֶץ רָעָשָׁה גַּם שָׁמַיִם נָטָפוּ
גַּם עָבִים נָטְפוּ מָיִם
5 הָרִים נָזְלוּ מִפְּנֵי יְהוָה
זֶה סִינַי מִפְּנֵי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל

4 Jehovah, when thou camest forth from Seir,
When thou marchedst from the field of Edom;
The earth trembled, the heavens also dropped,
Yea the clouds dropped water;
5 The mountains shook before Jehovah,
Sinai itself before Jehovah, God of Israel.

The extraordinary and supernatural manifestations of Jehovah's power which were witnessed on the grand occasion of the delivery of the Law on Sinai, are here depicted in a manner that places the scene directly before our eyes. We behold Jehovah enveloped in clouds advancing from the north and descending on Sinai; where his awful presence is indicated by the storm that rushes forth from his dark concealment,

and the thunder that shakes the earth and its mountains.[1] That this is the correct explanation of the passage, is clear from the mention of Sinai at its close, and from its correspondence with the historical description of that event and of the clouds, the thunder and lightning, and the quaking of the mountain by which it was accompanied, in Ex. xix. Here follows the imitation of this passage in the 8th and 9th verses of our psalm:

8 אֱלֹהִים בְּצֵאתְךָ לִפְנֵי עַמֶּךָ
בְּצַעְדְךָ בִישִׁימוֹן
9 אֶרֶץ רָעָשָׁה אַף שָׁמַיִם נָטְפוּ מִפְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים
זֶה סִינַי מִפְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל

8 O God, when thou wentest forth before thy people,
When thou didst march through the wilderness;
9 The earth trembled, yea the heavens dropped before God,
Sinai itself before God, the God of Israel.

The first circumstance which strikes us on comparing these verses with Judg. 5: 4, 5, is that the author of the psalm has condensed the last verse by throwing out the passage גַּם עָבִים נָטְפוּ מָיִם הָרִים נָזְלוּ, as he is about to speak more fully of rain in what follows; and consequently the phrase זֶה סִינַי וגו׳ now comes in rather abruptly. Again, the word יְהוָה has been altered in each case to אֱלֹהִים, either by the author himself, or by those who collected and made use of the portion of the psalms to which this belongs before they were incorporated into the Psalter as now existing.[2] Lastly, and which is of more importance, it will be seen that the change of one or two expressions has given the whole passage an application different from that which it has in Judges. By altering מִשֵּׂעִיר *from Seir*, into לִפְנֵי עַמֶּךָ *before thy people*, and מִשְׂדֵי אֱדוֹם *from the fields of Edom* into בִּישִׁימוֹן *through the wilderness*, it is made to refer chiefly no longer to the giving of the law, although the allusion to it is retained, but to God's leading his people through the wilderness, which brings this stanza into harmonious agreement with the two preceding ones; comp. verses 2 and 5. The same relation exists between the two similar passages, Deut. 33: 3, and Hab. 3: 3, 4. Commentators both ancient and modern, in remarking on the resemblance between all these passages, have commonly fallen into the error of assuming that, because one imitates the other, they must have exactly the same bearing and application; whereas nothing is better established than the fact that while the Hebrews

[1] Bertheau, das Buch der Richter und Rut. *Leipsic*, 1845.
[2] See Ewald, die poet. Bücher des alten Bundes, I. p. 192.

had a living language and literature, it was not uncommon for later writers, in quoting and copying the productions of earlier ones, to alter the language more or less, and even to remodel them, so as to suit analogous but different purposes.[1]

Verse 9. All nature is struck with terror as God approaches. See preceding remarks on Judg. 5: 4, 5; and comp. Hab. 3: 10.

Verse 10. The tremendous exhibitions of God's power over the elements just spoken of were not confined to the manifesting of his own greatness; they were employed also as a means of conveying comfort and support to his destitute people. The "*bounteous rain*" seems clearly to designate the celestial food with which they were supplied while in the desert, and especially the manna, which is said to have been "rained down" from heaven, in Exod. 16: 4 and again in Ps. 78: 24 (and so Schnurrer, De Wette, Lengerke).—נַחֲלָתְךָ וְנִלְאָה lit. *thy possession even wearied*, i. e. thy peculiar people when exhausted with their wanderings and privations. For similar uses of the conj. וְ, see the particle in Ges. Lex. No. 1. c.—Many understand this verse of rain simply, and the expression נַחֲלָתְךָ of the Holy Land, as in Exod. 15: 17. Jer. 2: 7. 16: 18. Ps. 79: 1.

Verse 11. חַיָּתְךָ *thy wild beasts*, i. e. which thou hast created, meaning the Canaanites, in opposition to the term עָנִי *meek and gentle one*, applied to the Israelites; comp. Sept. Vulg. Syr. The two expressions are contrasted in a similar manner in Ps. 74: 19; comp. also the figures employed in verses 6 and 7. It is usually supposed that חַיָּה here means simply *troop, multitude, people;* but to do so seems utterly to discard the proper force and meaning of the word. This appellation, it is true, is given to a body of soldiers, 2 Sam. 23: 11, 13; but they are Philistine soldiers, and it is there used in a contemptuous manner, equivalent to the term *herd*, instead of the usual מַחֲנֶה *host, camp*. The comparing of enemies to savage beasts, as dogs, bulls, lions, etc. is frequent in Hebrew poetry; and for an example we need go no further than the 31st verse of our psalm, where this very word is again used and in a connection which admits of no dispute as to its general application.—The suffix in the word בָּהּ refers to טוּבָתְךָ *thy good land*, in the next clause (Ges. Lehrg. p. 740). The fem. adj. טוֹבָה is used independently, with אֶרֶץ understood; like יַבָּשָׁה *dry land*, מְלֵחָה *salt, barren land*, and צִחִיחָה *thirsty land*, v. 7, the last of the preceding stanza and which corresponds to the present verse in general meaning. Others render *with thy goodness;* but this is incompatible with our interpretation of the context,

[1] See the examples cited by De Wette, introd. to Ps. 14, and by Ewald, Poet. BB. des alten Bundes, I. p. 203.

inasmuch as the word בָּהּ must then necessarily refer to נַחֲלָה in the preceding verse.—תָּכִין *thou preparest*, i. e. Jehovah now makes all things ready for the entrance of his people into their promised possession.

VERSE 12. *The Lord gives the word.* And now, the proper time being arrived, God the leader of his people gives the word for them to attack and destroy the wild beasts (the Canaanites) who had hitherto been allowed to hold possession of Israel's inheritance. For the sake of greater vividness of description, and to represent the events described as passing directly before the eye, the psalmist has made frequent use of the future tense; but the less vivacious character of the English language makes it necessary to sacrifice this beauty to perspicuity in the translation both here and elsewhere.—מְבַשְּׂרוֹת *the females that proclaim the glad tidings*, scil. of victory; comp. Exod. 15: 20. Judg. 5: 12. 11: 34. 1 Sam. 18: 6, etc. The song of victory follows.

VERSE 13. יְדֻדוּן יְדֻדוּן *they flee, they flee!* comp. the similar repetition, Judg. 5: 19.—נְוַת בַּיִת *she that abideth in the house*, Gr. *οἰκουρός*, Eng. *housewife;* a poetical appellation to denote the *women*, in opposition to men, who go forth to war, etc.; comp. נְשִׁים בָּאֹהֶל *women in the tent*, Judg. 5: 24.—It will be observed that there is a strong antithesis between the two clauses of this verse: kings and their armies run away, while the weak women of the Israelites divide the spoil—a sign of victory.

VERSE 14. Jacob, in speaking of Issachar's future condition of ease and plenty, says, Gen. 49: 14: יִשָּׂשכָר חֲמֹר גָּרֶם רֹבֵץ בֵּין הַמִּשְׁפְּתָיִם *Issachar is a strong ass crouching down among the folds.* In Judg. 5: 16, Deborah reproaching the tribe of Reuben for its want of patriotism in preferring the charms of rural quiet to the din of battle, says, לָמָּה יָשַׁבְתָּ בֵּין הַמִּשְׁפְּתָיִם, *why satest thou still among the folds?* So here the women, as they congratulate their countrymen on their victories, employ in allusion to the repose which their valor is about to secure for them the similar expression, אִם תִּשְׁכְּבוּן בֵּין שְׁפָתָיִם *when ye shall lie down among the folds.* The formative מ is here dropped, as in Ezek. 40: 43. The rendering "*pots*" of the English version is derived from the ܦܘܬܐ *hearths* of the Syriac and the ספתי הכיריס *hearth-stones* of Kimchi.—With the Chald. Jarchi, and Schnurrer, I understand יוֹנָה *the dove*, to signify the people of Israel, as it probably does also in Ps. 56: 1. This term is here used as a poetical equivalent to עֲנָיִי *the meek ones;* which in v. 11 is opposed to חַיַּת *the wild beasts*, the ferocious enemies of the Israelites. This interpretation is con-

firmed by the use of the analogous term תּוֹר *turtle-dove* in the same sense and in the same relation to the expressions just mentioned Ps. 74: 19.

The connection of this verse with the preceding is this: the women, as they divide the dresses, jewels, and other booty taken from the vanquished foe, exult in the prospect of wearing and displaying this finery after the wars are over; comp. Judg. 5: 30. The *silver* and *gold* denote the brilliant colors of the dove's plumage. Says Böttcher: "All the classical and rabbinical learning which Bochart has lavished on this passage (Hieroz. P. II. l. 1. c. 2.) amounts only to what every unlearned observer's experience might have told him: viz. he shows 1st, that the Roman poets applied to white doves the epithet *silvery;* 2dly, that doves after a certain age, at which they were no longer fit for offering, were said to turn of a *golden color;* and 3dly, that the necks of doves when moving about in the sunshine reflect all sorts of colors, among others that of *gold*."

Verse 15. In this obscure and difficult verse the psalmist seems to speak again in his own person and in allusion to the song just recited.—בָּהּ *in it* doubtless refers to the land of Canaan, as in the last verse of the preceding stanza.—צַלְמוֹן is regarded by some as a common noun meaning *shade, gloom;* so some Mss. of the Sept. *ἐν σκιᾷ*, and several later interpreters. But as the word occurs in only one other place, and there as the proper name of a mountain in Samaria, it is safest to take it in that sense here also. It is less easy to determine why this mountain should be introduced in this connection. It may be that historical events connected with it are here alluded to; but as there is no record of any such events we are at liberty to conclude, which is not at all unlikely, that it is mentioned simply on account of its name, *the shady, gloomy* (prob. because thickly covered with trees; see Judg. 9: 48).—The next thing is to ascertain the meaning of the verb תַּשְׁלֵג, which is found only in this place. Assuming that we are correct in referring the expression בָּהּ *in it* to אֶרֶץ *land* understood, and that צַלְמוֹן is the name of a mountain, it will follow almost of necessity that the fem. sing. verb תַּשְׁלֵג likewise agrees with אֶרֶץ understood, and that it is a denominative from שֶׁלֶג *snow*, and means *to snow* (like תְּמַטֵּר *to rain*) and intrans. *to become snowy* or *snow-white*.—The idea conveyed by the last clause will then be that the whole land was strewn with the corpses of the slain, till even the dark and gloomy Zalmon looked white as though covered with snow. Other interpretations worth considering will be found in Schnurrer, De Wette, and Lengerke,—especially that which regards תַּשְׁלֵג as impersonal, and gives it the meaning *to brighten up, to become lively, cheerful*,—though less consonant

than the one above given to the meanings we have assigned to the other terms of the context.

VERSE 16. Having thus rapidly sketched the induction of the chosen people by the hand of the Almighty into the land promised to their fathers, the poet now by an ingenious transition comes back to his principal theme, viz. the recent victorious return of the army with the ark, and the latter's safe deposit in the temple on Zion; comp. Judg. 5: 6. He now represents the lofty and rugged mountains of Bashan beyond Jordan as lowering with envy at the comparatively insignificant Mount Zion, which God has so highly favored as to choose it for his special and perpetual residence on earth,—for where the ark was there God was also. See Exod. 25: 22. 1 Kings 8: 10–13; and comp. Ps. 76: 3.[1] The nexus consists in the mention of Mount Zalmon in the preceding verse.—The term הַר *mountain* is used here, as often elsewhere, collectively for a range of mountains, i. q. the Germ. *Gebirg.* הַר אֱלֹהִים *a mountain of God*, i. e. a god-like, magnificent mountain.

VERSE 17. After praising the natural grandeur of the mountains of Bashan, the psalmist asks why they are not satisfied with this, but seem to envy the mountain on which God has chosen to confer spiritual superiority over others; comp. Mic. 4: 1–3 and Ps. 48.—The meaning "*skip*," which the English version assigns to the verb רָצַד, is a conjecture of the Chaldee interpreter from its resemblance to the verb רָקַד, also said of mountains Ps. 114: 4, 6 and elsewhere; but the true meaning of the word has been satisfactorily established from the Arabic, in which language it signifies *to watch with eagerness* or *jealousy*, as a wild beast its prey, or a camel others which are drinking while awaiting its own turn. With this agrees the interpretation of the Sept. and Vulg. *ὑπολαμβάνετε*, suspicamini.—הָרִים גַּבְנֻנִּים *mountains* that are *crags*, craggy mountains.—הָהָר חָמַד אֱלֹהִים לְשִׁבְתּוֹ lit. *the mountain* (which) *God hath desired for his dwelling.*—אַף יְהוָה יִשְׁכֹּן לָנֶצַח *yea* (where) *Jehovah abideth for ever*, i. e. sitteth enthroned, reigneth, taking שָׁכַן in a sense in which the synonymous verb יָשַׁב frequently occurs; and so Is. 57: 15.

VERSE 18. God, who is often said to *fight* for his people, and who is called a *man of war*, *Jehovah of hosts*, etc. is here represented as enthroned on Zion surrounded by countless multitudes of chariots, i. e. war-chariots of fire such as are spoken of in 2 Kings 6: 17. Accompanied by these celestial forces he had gone forth to combat for his people (comp. Hab. 3: 8–15), and now was returned with them to Zion.—אַלְפֵי שִׁנְאָן lit. *thousands of reduplication*, i. e. redoubled, re-

[1] The reader will bear in mind that the references are made to the *Hebrew* text.

peated. The English rendering "thousands of angels" is copied from the Chaldee translator, who appears to have taken שְׁאַנָּן as i. q. שַׁאֲנָן *tranquil*, which he regarded as equivalent to *happy ones, angels;* comp. Sept. and Vulg.—סִינַי בַּקֹּדֶשׁ *Sinai is* (now) *in the sanctuary*, i. e. the place of God's abode and communion with his people on earth, which in the ancient times before spoken of (stanza III.) was on Sinai, is now removed to Zion. Examples of a precisely similar use of proper names in classical writers are quoted by Schnurrer from Annotations on the Psalms by James Merrick, p. 141.

Verse 19. עָלִיתָ לַמָּרוֹם lit. *thou art come up to the height*, alluding to the bringing up of the ark with pomp and ceremony to its place in the temple on Zion; comp. 2 Sam. 6: 15. 1 Kings 8: 4. But the psalmist, instead of saying simply and prosaically *the ark has ascended*, says *thou* (God) *hast ascended*, because Jehovah's presence always accompanied the ark; comp. 1 Sam. 4: 7. Ps. 47: 6. לַמָּרוֹם may be rendered either *on high*, i. e. to heaven; or *to the height*, scil. of Zion, elsewhere called מְרוֹם צִיּוֹן *the height of Zion* Jer. 31: 12 and מְרוֹם יִשְׂרָאֵל *the height of Israel* Ezek. 17: 23, etc. The context shows that we are to take it in the latter sense; comp. Ps. 7: 7, 8. 132: 8.—שָׁבִיתָ שֶׁבִי *thou hast taken captives*, alluding to the late victory; and so Num. 21: 1. Judg. 5: 12.[1] The rendering of the English version, *thou hast led captivity captive*, is a servile copy of a common Hebrew idiom (see Ges. Lehrg. § 218. 5. *a*), after the example of the Septuagint.—לָקַחְתָּ מַתָּנוֹת בָּאָדָם *thou hast taken offerings in men*, referring to the heathen captives taken by the victorious Israelites, who had probably devoted themselves in the ancient manner to the God of their conquerors (and so De Wette). Even these rebels Jehovah graciously accepts, that he may reign the acknowledged God not of Israel only but of all mankind; comp. v. 17. As the quotation in Eph. 4: 8 rests on an exposition not warranted by the original text, no account need be taken of it here. Compare together the last clause of this verse and the last clause of verse 7, where the words are similar but the general sense is different; and so Ps. 49: 12, 20. 59: 10, 18.

Verse 20. יַעֲמֹס־לָנוּ. Nearly all interpreters either consider this verb as impersonal, and render *though one should cast loads upon us*, i. e. oppress us; or else they refer it to God, and render *even though he impose burdens* (i. e. trials) *upon us*. But neither of these interpretations is satisfactory. In the first place, the verb cannot

[1] The meaning *to lead forth captives* given to the phrase שָׁבָה שְׁבִי by Gesenius and others, rests on an erroneous exposition of Judg. 5: 12 seq., where is described, as Schnurrer has clearly shown, not a triumphal procession *after* the battle, but the going down of the host *to* the battle.

without the utmost violence be referred to any other subject than God, who is mentioned immediately before and after it, and forms the theme of the entire stanza; and again, whatever may be the exact meaning of the verb, the grateful and exulting tone of the whole context shows that it can be used in no other than a good sense. We are thus led to the opinion of Hupfeld (as quoted by De Wette), who regards the לְ as equivalent to אֵת the sign of the accusative, and renders, *he* (God) *beareth us*. This is the only instance in which the verb עָמַס is found with this preposition; when used in the sense of *placing a load upon*, it is always construed with the preposition עַל.

Another question perhaps more difficult to answer, is whether the phrase יוֹם יוֹם is to be connected with יַעֲמֹס־לָנוּ or with the preceding אֲדֹנָי בָּרוּךְ. Both the ancient versions and modern commentators agree with singular unanimity in adopting the latter construction; and still I think our English translators were correct in taking the opposite view, and accordingly translate, *Blessed be the Lord* (who) *beareth us day by day*, supplying the relative as in v. 17; comp. Ps. 28: 6. 31: 22. 66: 20. 124: 6. God is often spoken of as bearing his people as a father beareth his children, and that too *perpetually;* see Exod. 19: 4. Num. 11: 12. Deut. 1: 31. 33: 27. Ps. 28: 9. Is. 63: 9, and especially Is. 46: 3, *Hearken unto me, O house of Jacob, and all the remnant of the house of Israel,* הַעֲמֻסִים מִנִּי בָטֶן *who are borne* (by me) *from the belly, who are carried from the womb*, where the very same verb is employed. Another inducement to adopt this construction is that it makes a more perfect parallel. As to the accents, editions differ; but the oldest in my possession, that of Venice 1525, reads בָּרִיךְ אֲדֹנָי יוֹם ׀ יוֹם יַעֲמֹס־לָנוּ, which agrees with the interpretation given above, and so the Polyglotts and Van der Hooght.—יְשׁוּעָתֵנוּ *our salvation*, i. e. our saviour, preserver, especially in battle.

VERSE 21. הָאֵל לָנוּ *this God is ours*, taking לָנוּ predicatively with the English version.—לַמָּוֶת תּוֹצָאוֹת *the issues of* (i. e. from) *death*. Commentators have given themselves much unnecessary trouble with this phrase, rendering *goings forth to death, escapes for death*, etc., and all because they have not observed that the לְ, as in the preceding לְמוֹשָׁעוֹת, is a mere sign of the genitive, which is here rendered necessary by the inversion employed for the sake of having the two clauses end alike (see De Sacy, Gram. Arabe, I. § 1051, ed. 2); comp. וְכֹל יוֹצְאֵי מוֹצָא שְׂפָתֶיהָ הַתֵּבָה *all that go out of the ark* Gen. 9: 10. Exod. 1: 5, *what issues from her lips*, Num. 30: 13, and many like phrases.

VERSE 22. After praising God as the deliverer and preserver of his people, with especial reference to the victorious issue granted them in the recent battle, the psalmist goes on to depict the punishment

which God will yet inflict on those of his enemies who for the present elude his justice, and have not submitted, like the recently made proselytes (v. 19), to his rightful sway. Comp. the similar antithesis in the first stanza.—קָדְקֹד שֵׂעָר *hairy scalp* is merely a poetical equivalent for רֹאשׁ *head* in the first clause.

Verse 23. The psalmist gives weight to the prediction contained in this and the following verse, by introducing it in the shape of an oracle coming directly from God; comp. Ps. 60: 8 [6]. It is an amplification of the declaration contained in v. 22; comp. verses 2 and 3.

Wherever the enemies of God and his people may flee to and hide themselves, whether in the east or the west, in the heights of the mountains or the depths of the sea, God will bring them back from their retreats and deliver them over to Israel for destruction; comp. the strikingly parallel passage in Amos 9: 1–4, also Ps. 139: 7–10. The primary and usual meaning of the verb הֵשִׁיב, the relation of this passage to what has gone before, and especially the comparison of it with those just cited from other parts of Scripture, show that what is here meant is not, as some suppose, a mere *bringing together* of enemies for punishment, as in Joel 4: 2 [3: 2], but a *bringing back* of fugitives from God's justice. Still the introduction of the proper name Bashan warrants us in supposing with Rödiger that reference is here had to the geographical position of the particular countries alluded to in other parts of the psalm, viz. the Chaldeans [or Syrians] and Egyptians. It is surprising, as Schnurrer remarks, that some respectable interpreters (and among them our English translators) should apply what is here said to the Israelites, when the connection in which this verse stands with those which precede and follow it shows that the object to be understood is the *enemies* of God and his people.

Verse 24. This verse has exercised the ingenuity of interpreters from very early times, and probably will long continue to do so. In the original it reads as follows:

לְמַעַן תִּמְחַץ רַגְלְךָ בְּדָם
לְשׁוֹן כְּלָבֶיךָ מֵאֹרְבִים מִנֵּהוּ

The questions on which the construction and rendering of the whole verse turn are these: 1. What is the meaning of the verb תִּמְחַץ, and is it of the sec. pers. masc. sing. or the third pers. feminine? 2. What is the מִן of מִנֵּהוּ, and does its suffix refer to אֹרְבִים, to דָּם, or to לְשׁוֹן?

I. Rejecting as inadmissible all conjectural emendations of the text, the first interpretation that presents itself is as follows:

That thou mayest shake thy foot in blood,
(That) the tongue of thy dogs (may drink) of each of (thine) enemies.

Or as Rosenmüller renders the last clause: *lingua canum tuorum ex hostibus, ex unoquoque eorum*, scil. bibet. He considers that the sing. suffix of מִמֶּנּוּ *ex ipso* refers distributively to the plur. noun אֹיְבִים, so that the phrase מֵאֹיְבִים מִמֶּנּוּ is i. q. *of* (thine) *enemies, of each one* (of them); and he supplies the verb תִּשְׁתֶּה. This translation is objectionable on account of the violence of the supposed ellipsis in the second clause, where we are required to supply a verb different from that in the first clause and of a different gender, number, and construction. The proper meaning of the verb מָחַץ is not to "shake" but to *dash*; much less can we assign to it with Gesenius (sub. v. מָחַץ) the meaning to "lap" in the second clause. Besides, the termination thus given to the verse appears exceedingly flat and awkward and unworthy of so vigorous a writer as our psalmist. The construction is that of the Chaldee, Gesenius, and Rosenmüller.

II. One mode of obviating the difficulty which attends the construction of תִּמְחַץ, is to treat it as a third pers. fem. agreeing with רַגְלְךָ and לָשׁוֹן; thus:

To the end that thy foot may glisten in blood,
(That) the tongue of thy dogs (may glisten) from that of (thine) enemies.

Lit. *from* (thine) *enemies, even from it*, scil. their *blood*, דָּם, which is the corresponding word in the first clause. Such is the rendering of Ewald, who supports it by referring to the Arab. محص, which means *to dash*, and also *to flash, to glitter*, as lightning. This intransitive construction of the verb has the greatest weight of ancient authority in its favor, being adopted by the Sept. Vulg. and Syr., which render, *that thy foot may be dipped*, etc. R. Jehudah (quoted by Aben Ezra) and Kimchi explain מָחַץ as i. q. חָמַץ by transposition and as meaning *to become red*. Our English translators have adopted the rendering of the ancient versions in the text, and placed that of the rabbins in the margin. The merit of this translation is that it supposes in the second clause an easy and natural ellipsis of the verb contained in the first; comp. v. 22. The objections to it are that it gives to the verb מָחַץ a different meaning and construction from those which it has in v. 22 and the many other passages where it occurs, and ends the verse in the same faulty manner as before.

III. The interpretation which has found most favor in modern times is the following:

That thou mayest dash thy foot in blood,
(That) the tongue of thy dogs (may have) its portion of (thine) enemies.

Lit. according to Simonis, *ad linguam canum tuorum quod attinet, de hostibus* (sit) *ejus portio,* supplying merely the substantive verb. Here the first syllable of מִנֶּהוּ, which the other translations treat as a preposition, is regarded as the noun מֵן *portion* esp. of food. This etymology is adopted by Saadiah, Jarchi, Mendelssohn, and Sachs among Jewish, and by Simonis, Schnurrer, Böttcher, and De Wette among Christian scholars. The merits of this translation are that it preserves to the verb תְּמִחֵץ the same meaning and construction which it has in v. 22 and elsewhere; while it simplifies the construction of the second clause, and closes it with an important member of the proposition instead of an awkward and unnecessary particle. The objections made to it are: 1. That מֵן occurs nowhere else but as a preposition. To this it is replied that, although the noun מֵן is not actually found elsewhere, it may be derived with the greatest ease and certainty from the verb מָנַן, from whose correlative מָנָה we have the nouns of like meaning מָנָה and מִנָּת, the latter of which is used in a closely similar manner Ps. 63: 11; and even Lengerke is obliged to confess that a ἅπαξ λεγόμενον of this sort is by no means surprising in a writer so fond of uncommon words. It may be observed too that there is no other example of the form מִנֶּהוּ for מִמֶּנּוּ (the nearest approach to it being מֶנְהוּ Job 4: 12), and it is by no means unlikely that the punctators also regarded it as a noun. 2. It is objected that the noun לָשׁוֹן to which the masc. suff. ־הוּ is here made to refer, is properly of the fem. gender. This is answered by an appeal to Ps. 22: 16. Lam. 4: 4, etc. where it is plainly construed in the masculine. These arguments may be found more fully stated in Böttcher ad loc. —In the similar prediction Ps. 58: 11 we find the plainer verb רָחַץ *to bathe,* scil. the feet; but in the passage before us the verb מָחַץ appears to be employed partly on account of its greater boldness, and partly to produce a correspondence between this verse and v. 22.

This last interpretation I have concluded to adopt as liable to the least objection. There are a number of minor varieties of rendering, with which it is not necessary to trouble the reader; since the entire discussion is of little or no consequence except to the philologist who aims at scientific accuracy. The verse has no important bearing on any other part of the psalm; and besides, its general import is perfectly clear, and remains the same whichever mode of interpretation we adopt.

Verse 25. After the natural digression contained in the foregoing stanza, the psalmist proceeds to describe the order of the recent procession.—רָאוּ *they have seen,* scil. the enemies spoken of just before, who seem to be here represented as looking forth from their hiding-

places with fear and jealousy at the triumphant rejoicings of their victors.—הֲלִיכוֹתֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים *thy goings, O God*, i. e. the procession of the ark; comp. v. 5: 19.—בַּקֹּדֶשׁ *into the sanctuary*, i. e. on its way to the sanctuary; so Schnurrer and Mendelssohn. Others, *in the sanctuary*, i. e. in the courts of the temple; but this is contradicted by the expression שָׁם *there*, v. 28. The construction which unites בַּקֹּדֶשׁ to מַלְכִּי and renders *who art in the sanctuary* (Sept., Vulg., Böttch., De Wette) is too prosaic; as to the accents, they here prove nothing, as in Ps. 25: 19. 50: 13. 60: 4, 7, 8, etc. *In holiness* (Chald., Syr., Jarchi) is still more inadmissible.

VERSE 26. The description of the procession which here follows was doubtless suggested by Judg. 5: 12 sqq. The musicians, who performed a conspicuous part on such occasions (comp. 2 Sam. 6: 5, 15), lead the van.—*In the midst of damsels beating timbrels*, and walking on either side of the singers and players (Böttcher). The rendering of the English version, "*among* them were *the damsels*," etc. is borrowed from Kimchi, who offers it as a mere conjecture. It is totally inadmissible; because it requires us to read בַּתָּוֶךְ instead of the בְּתוֹךְ of the text, whose correctness is here vouched for by the unanimous testimony of the ancient versions.

VERSE 27. בְּמַקְהֲלוֹת *in the convocations, congregations, assemblies*, for worship in the temple, such as that in which the people now find themselves; and so Ps. 26: 12, the only other place where the word occurs (Lengerke). Consequently this verse does not represent what is sung in the procession, as some suppose; but is an outburst of gratitude in the form of an apostrophe, precisely like that in Ps. 22: 24.—מִמְקוֹר יִשְׂרָאֵל ye *of the fountain of Israel*, i. e. ye descendants, posterity of Israel; so עֵין יַעֲקֹב *the fountain of Jacob*, Deut. 33: 28; comp. Num. 24: 7. Is. 48: 1. As to the absolute use of the prep. מִן, comp. מִמְּךָ they that proceed *from thee*, thy posterity, Is. 58: 12; מִבֵּית תּוֹגַרְמָה they *of the house of Togarmah*, the Togarmathites, Ezek. 27: 14; מֵעִיר they *of the city*, the citizens, Ps. 72: 16.

VERSE 28. Here are mentioned some of the returning tribes with their chieftains who took part in the ceremony. The tribes enumerated, viz. the two nearest to Jerusalem and the two furthest off, seem designed to include the rest. Böttcher compares the prose expression "from Dan to Beersheba," to denote all Palestine. A comparison of this verse with Judg. 5: 14–18 exhibits in a striking light the power of condensation which is a characteristic of our psalmist.

The two words רִדֵּם and רִגְמָתָם have given much trouble to interpreters both ancient and modern. The Sept., Syr., and Vulg. derive the former from רָדַם *to sleep soundly;* the Chald. and Jarchi from יָרַד *to*

descend; Mendelssohn and Ewald render *their leader.* The word רִגְמָה is rendered by Sept., Vulg., Syr., Saad., *leaders* or *rulers;* by Jerome, M. ben Seruk, and Mendels., *purple*, i. q. אַרְגָּמָן; by Rosenmüller and others *stone*, i. e. support, comparing the expression *stone of Israel*, Gen. 49: 24. These interpretations are all opposed to the obvious etymology of the words or to the context. The following is De Wette's translation:

> There was Benjamin the youngest (and) their ruler,
> The princes of Judah (and) their band.

Which is essentially that of our English version. De Wette owns that it does not satisfy him; and in fact it is open to serious objections, both on the score of construction and meaning. The awkwardness of the sudden transition from the singular to the plural number, which arises from referring the suff. ם־ to בִּנְיָמִין and יְהוּדָה, notwithstanding that they are collectives, is heightened by the omission in each case of the copula וְ *and.* Besides, the verb רָגַם means *to trample on, to subdue* enemies; and then *to hold in subjection, to have dominion over*, scil. the people or kings of another nation. It is never used of a prince simply *ruling* over his own people, not even in Ps. 72: 8; comp. 1 Kings 5: 4 [4: 24]. As the word is thus used only in an unfavorable sense, we are naturally led to refer its suffix not to Benjamin, but to the *enemies* who are spoken of both in what precedes and in what follows. An examination of the corresponding word in the next clause confirms the correctness of this interpretation. The Arab. verb رَجَمَ means *to stone, to cast stones at* any one, and also *to heap up stones;* and its derivative رُجْمَةٌ signifies accordingly *a stoning, lapidation*, and also *a heap of stones.* The Heb. verb רָגַם and the Aram. רְגַם are used only in the first of the above meanings, viz. *to cast stones;* and hence the Syr. ܪܓܡ and the Chald. רְגוּמָא, רְגִימָא mean only *a stoning.* The inference is clear that the corresponding Heb. noun רִגְמָה is restricted to the same meaning with the Aramæan, i. e. *stoning, lapidation.* Hence we are not at liberty to render it, after the Arabic, *heap of stones;* much less can we suppose that this expression is used to denote *heap* in general, and then *multitude, troop*, i. e. soldiers (so Kimchi, De Wette, and others), or council (Seb. Münster and Eng. Vers.). I therefore render, with Böttcher and Lengerke:

> There is little Benjamin, their subduer;
> The princes of Judah, who showered stones upon them.

and suppose with them that the abstract noun *stoning* is used collectively to denote 'those who cast stones,' and that reference is had to the hurling or slinging of stones, which was an important part of ancient warfare; see further in Böttcher.

VERSE 29. *Thy God* (O Israel) *hath ordained thy might*, or rather *thy glory;* see next clause. God, who is here spoken of in the third person, is immediately afterwards addressed in the second; comp. similar transitions of person in vv. 2 and 3, 8 and 9 seq.—עוּזָּה אֱלֹהִים וגו׳. The Sept., Vulg., and Syr. render, *Strengthen, O God, what thou hast wrought for us*, i. e. do still greater things than thou hast already done for us. But a careful examination of the passages in which this verb occurs, shows that this causative meaning cannot properly be imputed to the Kal form; nor does it here yield a proper sense, because the prayer to which this forms the introduction is, not that God will confer yet greater favors on his people, but that he will cause himself to be glorified of men in consequence of the great things which he has done for Israel. Accordingly we must render, with Ewald, De Wette, and Lengerke, *Be thou glorious* (i. e. glorify thyself), *O God, who hast wrought for us.* The meaning thus given to the verb is supported by that of its derivative עֹז, which signifies *might, power*, and also *glorious might, glory;* and by the like meaning of the Arab. عَزَّ.—The same general sense is expressed by the Chaldee: *Show thyself mighty* (or *glorious*), *O God*, in *what thou hast made for us*, scil. the temple, mentioned in the following verse. But this construction, which is adopted in a different sense by Schnurrer and Rosenmüller, supposes an ellipsis which is not readily supplied.

VERSE 30. מֵהֵיכָלֶךָ *at thy temple.* The use of the prep. מִן to denote *direction* and then *locality*, which is found e. g. in the well known term מִבַּיִת (see Ges. Lex. מִן 3. h), seems to be extended to the similar expression מֵהֵיכָל or מִן הֵיכָל both in this place and in Ps. 45: 9. By adopting this rendering we are freed from the unsatisfactory interpretation of Symmachus, *because of thy temple*, which has found favor with most modern commentators; and without having recourse to De Wette's objectionable expedient of connecting this clause with the preceding verse. The only versions in which I find the rendering here proposed are the Ethiopic and Arabic.—לְךָ יוֹבִילוּ וגו׳ lit. *to thee let kings bring gifts in procession*, scil. in token of homage; an allusion to the well known oriental custom, both in ancient and modern times, of bearing gifts to a great man with much pomp and display.

This last phrase may assist us in estimating the date of the

psalm. The first writer who makes use of the verb רָבַל and whose age is known with historical certainty is *Isaiah*. It is afterwards employed by Jeremiah, Hosea, and Zephaniah, and it occurs repeatedly in the Psalms and in Job; see Ges. Lex. where all the passages are cited. The word שַׁי is found only in connection with the verb just mentioned. It is used by Isaiah in the phrase יוּבַל שַׁי *presents shall be brought*, scil. from Ethiopia, Is. 18: 7; and also in Ps. 76: 12, which speaks of bringing presents to God.

Verse 31. חַיַּת קָנֶה *the beast of the reeds.* Aben Ezra explains קָנֶה to mean *spears*, after the Arabic usage, and renders חַיַּת קָנֶה *the company of spearmen*, in which he is followed by Kimchi and the English version. But this interpretation is opposed by the following clause; from which it is evident that the words must be taken in their primary signification to denote a savage beast of some kind, and that this beast must represent some inimical prince or people. Jarchi accordingly supposes it to mean the *wild boar*, and to typify the Edomites; but he has found few to acquiesce in his views. The common opinion among modern commentators is, that it denotes the *crocodile*, and that this is a figure for Egypt. They base it on the supposition that this verse and the next refer to the same people. But this is not necessarily the case; on the contrary they seem, when closely compared with each other and with what follows, to speak in a different tone and not improbably of different nations. Hence the opinion of Saadiah, Lowth, Schnurrer, and Böttcher is to be preferred, who suppose the animal intended to be the *lion*. That the cane-brakes which fringe the banks of the Jordan were in ancient times the common resort of lions, is evident from Jer. 49: 19. 50: 44. Zech. 11: 3; comp. Relandi Palest. p. 274. It is not unlikely too that these animals infested more particularly the northern parts of the river, owing to the frequently disturbed state of the regions round about it; and this would render the lion a peculiarly appropriate representative of a northern or north-eastern enemy, comp. Jer. 4: 6, 7. The repeated allusions to *Bashan* in an unfavorable sense (v. 16 and 23) and the use of the word אַבִּירִים *bulls* in the same manner as אַבִּירֵי בָשָׁן *bulls of Bashan*, Ps. 22: 13, cause me to refer the terms of this verse, with Schnurrer and Böttcher, to an enemy situated to the north-east, say the Syrians. The mention of *kings* in the preceding verse authorizes us to understand with Schnurrer חַיַּת קָנֶה as denoting the enemy's king, just as תַּנִּין *crocodile* is used to represent the king of Egypt, Ezek. 29: 3. 32: 2.

The terms *bulls* and *calves* in the next clause will then fitly designate the military leaders and the soldiers or common people.—עֶגְלֵי

עַמִּים lit. *the calves of the nations*, i. e. of the heathen countries; comp. the phrase חֲרָתוֹ גּוֹי i. q. חֲרָתוֹ אֶרֶץ Zeph. 2: 14. The Chald. and Syr. explain this of idols.—מִתְרַפֵּס בִּרְצוֹי כָּסֶף *who humbleth himself for bits of silver*. This phrase is usually applied to the enemies collectively. De Wette adopts the construction of the Sept., Vulg., Aben Ezra, Eng. Vers., and Ros., and renders *that they may prostrate themselves with pieces of silver;* but he candidly owns that such a use of the participle is without a parallel. It is better to adhere to the relative construction of the Chald., Ewald, and Lengerke, which is so common in Hebrew poetry; at the same time referring it, not to the enemies in general, but to their *king*, חַיַּת קָנֶה, with which expression it logically agrees in the masc. singular. With Sachs I have assigned to the preposition בְּ the meaning *for, for the sake of*, as in Gen. 29: 18. According to this rendering, the enemy's king is represented as subjecting himself to the shame of defeat in battle for the sake of the booty which he had vainly hoped to carry away (as in Judg. 5: 19); comp. the concluding expression of the other member of the parallel, "the nations that *delight in war*."—בְּזַר *scatter thou*. In this single instance I reluctantly depart from the Masoretic punctuation, along with the ancient versions and most modern interpreters, and read the verb in the imperative בַּזַּר; which the context seems almost absolutely to require. If we retain the preterite pointing בִּזַּר, we must render, *Yea, he scatters the nations*, etc.; but this interrupts the continuity too much.

Verse 32. מִנִּי מִצְרַיִם *out of Egypt*. This poetic form of the preposition is used twice in Judg. 5: 14, in similar phrases.—כּוּשׁ תָּרִיץ יָדָיו *let Ethiopia quickly stretch forth her hands*, lit. make its hands run. The verb תָּרִיץ, which immediately follows the subject, agrees with it as the name of a country in the fem. sing.; but in the word יָדָיו, which is removed a degree further from it, the agreement is neglected as far as the gender is concerned, the suffix being put in the masculine. Comp. the similar instances רוּחַ גְּדוֹלָה וְחָזָק 1 Kings 19: 11. אֶרֶץ צִיָּה וְעָיֵף Ps. 63: 2. The verse expresses the wish that Egypt and Ethiopia may soon come as tributaries to Jehovah, and join his chosen people in acknowledging his sovereignty. It is only by taking the verse in this favorable sense that we obtain a natural transition to the following stanza. Comp. the like kindly predictions respecting these nations in Is. 18: 7. 19: 19–25. Ps. 87: 4.

Verse 33. The psalmist, reverting to the general theme of the second stanza, but introducing different expressions in accordance with what has gone before, now calls upon all the kingdoms of the earth to sing the praises of God.

Verse 34. לָרֹכֵב בִּשְׁמֵי שְׁמֵי קֶדֶם *to him that rideth upon the heavens, the heavens of old;* comp. הָרְרֵי קֶדֶם *the ancient mountains* Num. 23: 7. Deut. 33: 15. נַחַל קְדוּמִים *that ancient river* Judg. 5: 21. As the writer designedly introduces specific differences between this and the second stanza, we are not to force upon the phrase לָרֹכֵב בָּעֲרָבוֹת v. 5 an exact conformity of meaning with the present clause; comp. the closing remarks on v. 19. As to the two construct nouns in apposition, see the same construction Judg. 19: 22. Ps. 78: 9, and comp. the expression בְּתוּלַת בַּת צִיּוֹן etc. so often used by Isaiah and Jeremiah (Ges. Lehrg. p. 677).—יִתֵּן בְּקוֹלוֹ קוֹל עֹז *he utters* (i. e. speaks) *with his voice, a mighty voice*, alluding to the thunder, as in Ps. 46: 7. We have here a repetition for the sake of emphasis like that in the first clause; comp. Ps. 106: 7.

Verse 35. עַל יִשְׂרָאֵל גַּאֲוָתוֹ *his majesty is over Israel*, scil. as a protection. This and the preceding verse seem to contain a reminiscence of Deut. 33: 26; comp. Ps. 36: 6. 57: 11. 103: 19.

Verse 36. מִמִּקְדָּשֶׁיךָ *in thy sanctuaries;* comp. v. 30 and Ps. 135: 21. The plural is used here as elsewhere of the temple on Zion, which formed an assemblage of many parts; comp. Jer. 51: 51. Ezek. 21: 7. Ps. 73: 17. 74: 7. The tabernacle is always called in the singular מִקְדָּשׁ; for the plur. מִקְדָּשִׁים which occurs in Lev. 21: 23 means *hallowed things* i. q. קָדָשִׁים 22: 2, 3, 4, etc. Comp. the like use of the plur. חֲצֵרוֹת *courts* Ps. 84: 3, 11. מִשְׁכָּנִים *dwellings* Ps. 46: 5. 84: 2. 132: 5.—The Hebrews often employ the definite article where we should make use of a passive pronoun; so here the expression הָעָם *the people* is equivalent to עַמּוֹ *his people* in Ps. 29: 11.

Occasion and Date.

The most difficult of all the difficult questions that belong to the interpretation of this psalm—viz. What is the occasion that called it forth and the date of its composition?—I have purposely deferred to the last; because our only reliable guide to a solution of it is to be looked for in hints scattered up and down the psalm itself, and in order to understand their force, it is necessary that they should first be examined in detail.

The chief opinions that have been broached respecting the origin of this psalm are the following:

1. It was composed by David, to celebrate the exodus from Egypt and the giving of the Law on Sinai.—So the older rabbins.

2. Composed by David, on the occasion of bringing the ark from

the house of Obed Edom to Jerusalem (2 Sam. 16: 12 seq.).—So *Lowth, Schnurrer, Rosenmüller.*

3. Composed by David, to celebrate a victory over the heathen.—*Aben Ezra.*

4. Composed in the time of David, to celebrate the bringing back of the ark after a victorious battle with north-eastern enemies, to wit, Syrians and Ammonites (see 2 Sam. 8—12).—*Böttcher.*

5. Celebrates the bringing back of the ark to the temple after a victorious battle, subsequent to David's reign and before the separation into the kingdoms of Judah and Israel.—*De Wette.*

6. A joint victory of the two kingdoms over the Moabites.—*Hitzig.*

7. Hezekiah's deliverance from the invasion of Sennacherib, king of Assyria (2 Kings 19: 35, 36).—*D. Kimchi.*

8. Celebrates in a general way the praises of Jehovah as the God of victory, occasioned however by some occurrence that took place between Judah and Egypt about the close of the seventh century B. C. —*Rödiger, Lengerke.*

9. The dedication of the second temple.—*Ewald.*

The reader in casting his eye over this list will perceive that the differences of opinion among the ablest commentators as to the period to which this composition belongs, are so great as to cover, like the theories respecting the date of the book of Job, the entire history of the Jewish nation. The conclusion which naturally arises to the mind from such an exhibition of conflicting views, is that the question, for want of sufficient data, is incapable of a satisfactory solution; and such perhaps is really the case. Still, while we have before us the wonderful disclosures which modern criticism is constantly making with regard to matters apparently far more difficult and hopeless than this, it would be presumptuous in the extreme to set a limit to its powers and affirm that what now is doubtful must necessarily remain so forever. Let us then endeavor in the meantime, by weighing the scanty evidence presented to us, to ascertain which of these views has the greatest probabilities in its favor, and thus contribute our mite to the final settlement of the question, if that be possible.

Of course the early expositors, both Jews and Christians, who received the superscriptions of the psalms as of equal antiquity and authority with the psalms themselves, were unanimous in attributing this one to David. But when it came to be shown that many of these inscriptions are manifestly erroneous, and that consequently as a whole they are of no authority whatever, the date of the present composition was gradually lowered by critics until finally placed by Ewald at the completion of Zerubbabel's temple. The reason why they did so is,

that the psalm contains expressions and allusions which seem inconsistent with the supposition that it was written at so early a date as the reign of David.

Thus we have already shown, in commenting on the psalm, that the first writer that uses the phrases מְעוֹן קָדְשׁוֹ (v. 6) and חוֹבִיל שֵׁי (v. 30), and whose age is known with certainty, is Isaiah. Again, in v. 32 we have a prediction respecting the future submission of Egypt and Cush to Jehovah. Now such joint predictions are not found in the Hebrew writings until the period when Upper Egypt was united to Ethiopia under the same sovereigns in the reigns of Ahaz and Hezekiah kings of Judah,[1] when they became quite common; see Is. 18: 7. 19: 18, 21, 23. 20: 3, 4, 5. 43: 3. 45: 14. 46: 8, 9. Nah. 3: 9. Ezek. 30: 4, 9. Dan. 11: 42, 43. Ps. 87: 4. These facts warrant us in assuming with a good degree of likelihood that this psalm was not composed before the reign of Ahaz. With this agrees well the character of the whole production, which in its historical reminiscences bears a strong family resemblance to the later psalms 78, 80, 81, 105, 106, 135, 136. As to the particular passages, compare the likening of manna to rain (v. 10) with Ps. 78: 24; the antithetic use of חַיָּה and עָנִי (v. 11) with Ps. 74: 19; the future gathering together of enemies for punishment (vs. 23 and 24) with Joel 4: 2 [3: 2]. Amos 9: 1—4. Ps. 139: 7—10; the coming of kings with gifts (v. 30) with Ps. 72: 10; and the description of God's glory (vs. 34 and 35) with Deut. 33: 26.

On the other hand the psalm cannot well have been produced after the captivity. Though historical in its character, it does not contain the slightest reference to that great event. Its bold, free style, abounding in *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* and other rare words, bespeaks an origin anterior to the period when the language had lost much of its original purity and vigor. Moreover, the enumeration of the tribes, v. 28, is altogether opposed to the assumption of a date when all the tribes had become fused together into a single nation of Jews.

In accordance with these arguments, the events which the psalm celebrates should lie between the accession of Ahaz to the throne of Judah B. C. 741 and the deposition of Zedekiah by Nebuchadnezzar B. C. 588. It is true that the mention of the tribes Judah and Benjamin, Zebulon and Naphtali, would naturally suggest a period either before the separation of the two kingdoms of Judah and Israel or when they were united together against their common enemies in the days of Jehoshaphat and Ahab (1 Kings 22) or of Ahaziah and Jehoram (2 Kings 8: 25—29). But if the indications just pointed out are to

[1] See Gesenius, Com. on Isaiah, I. p. 595—599.

be relied on, we must account for the appearance of these names in some other way. Thus we may suppose that many individuals from the northern tribes had either been left behind in their own country or had taken refuge in Judah when the main body of the population was carried off, and that these had assisted their kinsmen and protectors in the late battle.

From various concurrent circumstances, this enemy is to be sought in the *north-east*. These circumstances are the mention of the *Araboth* traversed by the returning host (v. 5); the repeated allusions to *Bashan* as an inimical region (vs. 16 and 23); and the epithet of the enemy's king, *beast of the reeds*, meaning the *lion*, so similar to that applied to a northern enemy by Jeremiah (v. 31). The conclusion to which they lead us is corroborated by the fact that the psalmist has taken as his model the Song of Deborah and Barak (see remarks on verses 2, 5, 18, 7, 13, 14, 19, 31, 32), not improbably because the latter celebrates a victory over a northern enemy in ancient times.

All these facts and arguments seem to indicate that the psalm was composed somewhere between the reigns of Ahaz and Zedekiah shortly after a battle between the forces of Judah assisted by Israelites on the one side and a north-eastern people, say the Syrians, on the other, in which the former were partially victorious; while the predictions in verses 23, 24, and 32, appear to refer to previous struggles with Egypt and Ethiopia.

To come to a more definite conclusion than this and point to some occurrence within the limits specified which shall completely answer to the indications set forth, is a difficult if not an impossible task. The sudden destruction of Sennacherib's army, it is true, suggests itself at once; and history relates many circumstances preceding, attending, and following it (especially if we adopt the account of Hezekiah's reign as given in the book of Chronicles), which admirably suit this psalm; for which reason Kimchi, and it is said many other rabbins,[1] interpreted it of that memorable event. But there are two circumstances which forbid us to adopt this exposition; one is the fact that, according to all the ancient authorities, the defeat of the Assyrian army was produced without any agency of the Jews, who were shut up in their capital at the time;[2] the other is the good understanding which then existed between Judah and Egypt. The brief annals of Judah from Manasseh to Jehoahaz (2 Kings 21: 1—23: 3) offer no occurrence to which the psalm can be referred. We are thus brought to the conclusion, already arrived at by Prof. Rödiger and adopted by

[1] Poli Synopsis Criticorum, ad Ps. LXVIII.

[2] 2 Kings 19: 35. Herodotus 2. 141. Berosus in Josephus, Antiqq. 10, 1.

Lengerke, that the event which gave rise to the psalm must have occurred in the time of Necho king of Egypt near the close of the seventh century, B. C. If required to specify the occasion more nearly, I would suggest that it may have been one of the contests with nations east of the Jordan in the time of Jehoiakim mentioned 2 Kings 24: 2. It is true that these contests are spoken of as resulting unfavorably to the Jews; but we may suppose that, although adverse on the whole, victory sometimes inclined to the side of the latter.

If this be objected to as unsatisfactory, I can only lament, as many have done before me, that want of certain information which such conjectures can but ill supply. But though some points still remain subject to doubt, the labor devoted to the exposition of this psalm will not have been spent in vain, provided we have truly explained its general scope and design, and exhibited the connection in which its several parts stand to each other so as to constitute a harmoniously proportioned whole. This is plainly the first duty of an expositor, and forms the only true and legitimate groundwork for the higher exegesis of any portion of the Sacred Writings. This alone can gradually bring the world to something like unity of opinion respecting their meaning, and release them from the condition of a nose of wax in the hands of ingenious theologians to be twisted into any shape that may suit their purposes. Entertaining these views, it will not be surprising that, to use the words of bishop Patrick, "I have forborne a great many mystical and allegorical senses of words, and rather adhered to the literal meaning, though accounted trivial and vulgar by many men; who had rather indulge to their own fancies than be at the pains of making a diligent inquiry after the truth. For, whatsoever is pretended, it is not the easiness and meanness of the literal sense which have made it to be despised, and been the cause of allegorizing the Scriptures; but the great difficulty and labor that are required to the finding of it out in many places."

ARTICLE VII.

OF THE DIVINE AGENCY IN THE PRODUCTION OF MATERIAL PHENOMENA.

By George I. Chace, Prof. of Chemistry and Geology, Brown University.

WHAT is matter? Has it a real existence, or is it merely phenomenal? Does it consist of atoms, endowed each with certain properties, or is it made up of points, around each of which certain powers are constantly manifested? Has it a separate and independent existence and does it act by virtue of its own inherent energies, or are the effects which we commonly refer to matter, in reality due to the Divine power exerted within certain prescribed limits and according to certain prescribed laws? Is the external world through all its parts and in all its relations, what our senses represent it to us, or are we deceived by our senses and led to infer reality or substance where there are only appearances?

On this question, the schools, both in ancient and modern times, have been divided. The Hindoo sages, who three thousand years ago, taught philosophy upon the banks of the Indus and the Ganges, inculcated the belief in simple phenomena. According to their doctrine, matter has no real existence. It is only the sensible manifestation of the Divine essence. The world is a perpetual creation; the universe a vast system of appearances, supported and kept up by the constant presence and power of the Deity. It is in fact, Brahm, their supreme God, acting. When this great being sinks into repose, which according to the Indian mythology has repeatedly happened, then all matter is annihilated, and spirits even "endowed with principles of action, depart from their several acts," and go to be reäbsorbed in the Divine substance. When at length, after ages of slumber, he again wakes to action, then the universe once more appears, pervaded in every part by life, order and beauty.

The ancient Egyptian philosophers, less subtile and refined in their speculations, were content to admit the existence of matter on the simple testimony of the senses. They however supposed it to be pervaded everywhere by the Deity, and ascribed to this cause the exhibition of its powers and properties. Indeed, the triads so universally worshipped in the temples on the Nile, were only personified types or emblems of a primary law of nature regulating and controll-

ing the evolution of all its phenomena. Nothing acts by itself. In order that any one element or one portion of matter may exhibit its properties, it must be brought into relation to some other element or other portion of matter. Without this, it remains wholly inert. But when this indispensable condition has been secured, then an immediate action ensues, which though itself incapable of being perceived by the senses, is rendered sufficiently manifest through the effects produced by it. Thus oxygen alone has no power. Hydrogen alone has no power. But when these two gases are brought together at the proper temperature, they reäct upon one another with irresistible energy, and give rise to the formation of water as the product of their reäction. The revolution of the planets about the sun, is not due simply to the attractive power of that central orb. It is equally dependent upon a corresponding power residing within the planets themselves, without which that of the sun could never have been exerted. This law of dualism belongs essentially to every kind of physical causation; whenever an effect is produced or a phenomenon is exhibited, there must always be at least two separate and distinct agents standing in the common relation of cause to it. The law is universal and constitutes, it is probable, one of the features which distinguish all created from creative power. Three things, therefore, are necessarily included in our idea of physical causation; viz. something acting, something acted upon, and something produced by that action; or to express the relation more exactly, two things acting upon each other (for the action is mutual and proceeds from the two equally), and a *tertium quid* or third thing resulting from their action.

Now this was the essential idea of the Egyptian trinity. Osiris, Isis, and their child Orus were only personal representations of it, clothed with divine attributes in accordance with their habit of looking upon everything in which there was a manifestation of power as immediately pervaded by God. The same is true of their other triads under whatever name or form they were worshipped. Intellect, matter, and the universe; the Nile, Egypt, and its fruits; heat, light and flame, together with numerous other groups of a similar constitution, were regarded by them as so many types of this fundamental law of nature, which lies at the origin and source of all its phenomena. The Egyptians, therefore, instead of refining away the existence of matter, by supposing the external world a mere illusion, kept up by the Divine agency, seem rather to have deified it by elevating its simple properties to the place of divinities and rendering to them acts of adoration and worship.

In the transcendental schools of Germany and France we find at

the present time a revival of the ancient Hindoo doctrine. It is however presented under a somewhat different form and clothed in a more philosophic garb. Matter has a real existence. It is in truth what our senses represent it. But then it exists only as an effect of which God is the immediate cause, as in the Oriental system the world is a perpetual creation. It is kept in being only by the constant presence and agency of the Deity through all its parts. It is however a reality, not an illusion. It is real in itself as well as real to us. It is the constant and necessary effect of the Divine existence. For God, such is his nature or essence, cannot but act, cannot but manifest himself; and that manifestation is the universe. God is not the universe, not the 'anima mundi' or soul of the universe, does not act through the universe; but the universe is evolved from him. God is the absolute, infinite and eternal cause, and the universe is the constant and necessary effect.

These transcendental ideas of the relation of matter to Deity, however plausible they may at first appear, will be seen upon reflection, if we mistake not, to be without any intelligible foundation. They are moreover vague, and we think to most minds incomprehensible. They confound two things in their nature wholly distinct—ordinary physical causation and creation; that agency by which mere changes are produced in matter, and that to which matter itself owes its existence. They aim at the solution of a problem which no facts touch, which no analogies reach, which lies without the range of our faculties. They aim at an explanation of the *mode* of creation.

There is another view of the nature and constitution of matter nearly allied to the ancient Hindoo notion, which has been frequently associated with the doctrines of Christianity, and which we are inclined to believe, is quite generally entertained at the present time, by the teachers of our holy religion. This view allows to matter a real existence. It regards it as actual substance; created indeed by the almighty power of God, but having in itself the attributes of extension, form and solidity, possessing the properties of attraction and repulsion, and being in all other respects what our senses and the investigations of science would lead us to believe it. Having made these important admissions, those who adopt this view, instead of referring the powers which they see exhibited in connection with matter to its own inherent properties, seek for them a higher origin, by deriving them immediately from the great source of all power. They do not look upon the phenomena of the natural world, as spontaneously evolved, growing directly and naturally out of the constitution and arrangement of its several parts, but suppose them to be dependent in

their evolution upon the universal and ceaseless agency of the Divine Being. They adopt this view because they believe it to be both simple and satisfactory. They do not regard it as necessary and forced upon the mind by its own imperious dictates. Neither do they suppose it indicated or even suggested by anything which they perceive in nature. Nor is it in their opinion an article of faith inculcated by the teachings of Christianity. But they imagine it to be easier of comprehension than any other way of accounting for the production of natural phenomena, and also more in harmony with that superintending providence, which we are taught by Christianity God continually exercises over the affairs of our world. On these grounds they are apparently content to adopt the supposition without inquiring very particularly whether there be any real evidence of its truth. And yet a little reflection, it would seem, should be sufficient to satisfy any person, that of all the ideas which have been entertained in relation to matter, the one we are now considering is the least philosophical. Like the Hindoo belief it refers all our perceptions of the external world directly to the power of Deity, while at the same time it retains the cumbrous and unnecessary hypothesis of its real existence. It commits the logical solecism of inferring matter from the impression which it makes upon our senses and then attributing that impression immediately to a power without and above matter. It wants the consistency and the completeness of either the Egyptian or the Indian doctrine.

Turning from these various ideas which have been entertained at different times and by different schools of philosophy in regard to the nature of matter, let us now examine the subject proposed upon its own merits and see whether there be any sufficient ground for an opinion concerning it. The source of evidence to which we should naturally direct our attention first in such an inquiry, is the testimony of the senses. What then is this testimony? How is it to be interpreted, and what is the authority properly belonging to it?

When we look at an object or place our hand upon it, what is the idea immediately awakened in our minds? Is it that of a phenomenon merely? Or is it the idea of a thing, associated with the belief of its actual existence? On this point there can be but one opinion. The language of our perceptions is too plain to admit of misunderstanding or doubt. Even the philosopher who in his search after truth has attempted to push his inquiries behind those intuitions or first principles which lie at the source of all our knowledge, and has thus involved himself in inextricable confusion and uncertainty so that he has at length come to question everything, not excepting his own ex-

istence, is able to retain his skepticism only so long as he remains shut up within his chamber and contemplates the ideas alone of the objects without. The moment he is surrounded by these objects and feels their direct impression, his philosophy yields to the irresistible power of the senses and he is carried away with "the common herd of believers." All men are so constituted that they cannot help believing in the reality of what they see or feel or gain a knowledge of, through any of the senses. They feel as fully assured of it, as of their own existence. They look upon it as certain, as that two and two make four or the whole is greater than any of its parts. This feeling of assurance, this conviction of absolute certainty is naturally and inseparably connected with the exercise of all our perceptive faculties. We cannot resist it, if we would. It is forced upon us by an imperious necessity. It is a part of our nature and we cannot escape it without ceasing to be ourselves.

Now such being our constitution, whatever knowledge we gain through the senses is to be regarded as coming from God, the author of our constitution, as much as if it were imparted by his immediate inspiration. Though acquired by the use of our natural powers and faculties, it is nevertheless as really and as truly given to us by Him, as if the communication had been direct and wholly independent of these instrumentalities. The information derived through the senses, therefore, rests upon the same ground as the truths of revelation, viz. the Divine veracity. This, indeed, is the only foundation which we can claim for any of our knowledge, whether received mediately or immediately. God having made us, we are dependent upon Him for the truthfulness as well as the extent of our faculties. We know nothing absolutely and entirely but only so far and in such relations as it hath pleased Him to give us the power of apprehending it. Not only our knowledge but our capacities of knowledge are thus bound round on all sides by impassable limits. Within these limits whatever comes to us through the proper exercise of either our rational or our perceptive powers, bears upon it the impress of certainty. We cannot doubt it if we would. It brings with it the Divine sanction, and God himself is responsible for its truth. Without those limits, all is speculation and conjecture, wearing in some cases it may be the garb of probability, but always destitute of that character of certainty which alone gives claim to the distinction of knowledge.

The testimony of the senses, therefore, in relation to the existence and attributes of matter must be admitted. Coming from the same source, it has equal authority with the dictates of reason or the voice of inspiration. We cannot question it, without questioning the truth-

fulness of our constitution, nay, the veracity of God himself; without questioning everything through whatever channel derived. Our own existence even is not surer to us than that of matter. Both stand upon the same foundation. Neither of them is an object of distinct apprehension. One is revealed to us through our consciousness, and the other through our perceptions, and any distrust of either of these sources of information would undermine the foundations of all our knowledge, and plunge us at once into universal and hopeless skepticism.

But admitting fully the existence of matter and allowing to it the possession of powers and properties, may we not suppose these latter to be continually maintained and supported by the Deity, and in this way to be in fact only a manifestation of his power? We think not. The idea, as it seems to us, is self-contradictory. It supposes the actual existence of matter and properties essentially belonging to it, and at the same time supposes these properties to be dependent upon a power without matter; two suppositions not only irreconcilable with one another, but also incompatible with our very notion of the relation between property and substance, between power and that in which it resides and from which it is manifested. We cannot, therefore, consistently believe the phenomena of the material world to be dependent upon the immediate power of Deity, unless we suppose the material world itself to be equally dependent upon that power, by which supposition we really do away with its proper and separate existence and must have recourse to some one of the forms of idealism.

As, however, the general question concerning the relation which God holds to matter is not altogether unimportant in its theological bearings, and is, moreover, one upon which men from their different mental habits are inclined to think differently, it may be worth while to inquire, whether besides the testimony of the senses and the suggestion of the reason, there may not be found other evidence having a bearing upon it. Turning away from what may be called the metaphysical view of the question, may we not look at it through the actual phenomena of matter? May we not investigate it as a question of fact? May we not bring to bear upon it our experience, what we have learned of the constitution and arrangement of things in the world around us? And may we not hope from this source to gain additional light concerning it?

In the prosecution of our inquiry thus far, we have seen that the material bodies by which we are surrounded present themselves to the mind, not as phenomena, but as real existences—actual substances, possessing properties and acting by virtue of those properties. God

has so made us, and placed us in such relations to these bodies, that we are naturally and instinctively led to take this view of their constitution. Nay further, such is the structure of our minds, that this view is forced upon us, so that we cannot avoid it without doing the greatest violence to our understandings.

But this is not all. God has made use of the different kinds of matter for the construction of our globe, and for the formation of the innumerable races of organic beings which he has placed upon it. And in doing so, he has everywhere employed the material elements in strict accordance with the idea of their constitution which he has revealed to us through our perceptive and rational natures, and for the truth of which he has pledged the Divine word and veracity. He has employed them in precisely the same manner as (granting us the requisite power and skill) we ourselves would make use of them for like purposes. We might draw our illustrations of this fact, from every department of nature. As so extended a view of the subject, however, is not necessary to our purpose, we shall confine ourselves to a few instances, taken principally from the animal kingdom. We choose these, because with few exceptions, we comprehend fully the ends proposed, in the several parts of the animal structure, and understand perfectly the means employed for their accomplishment.

If we look over the earth's surface, we shall find it divided into districts of greater or less extent, shut in on all sides by seas, mountains and deserts, or by the equally impassable barriers of temperature. Within each of these districts there prevail certain conditions in respect to soil, climate, etc., which fix its geographical character, and also determine the character of the vegetable tribes to be planted upon it. These latter, in connection with a still larger assemblage of physical conditions, determine the mode of life to which the animals occupying it must be adapted. We must therefore suppose the Creator when preparing to furnish the different portions of the earth with inhabitants, to have had a distinct view of the circumstances under which each of the animals about to be formed, would pass its existence, together with precise conceptions of the powers and capabilities required in the several parts of its organization to fit it for living under those circumstances.

Now, in the actual constitution of animals, these powers and capabilities are not created, but developed. They are not brought into existence by the direct exertion of the Divine power, but attained by the proper employment of means fitted in their character to produce them. The material atoms are so combined with one another, and are wrought in such a manner into the fabric of the animal, as to de-

velop by their own inherent endowments in each part, the precise qualities required in it. The skeleton, which is the frame-work of the animal, and which to a great extent determines the character of the other parts, is constructed on strictly mechanical principles. The several bones composing it, are fitted to one another in such a manner, as to render them capable of just those motions, and those only, which are required by the natural habits of the animal. The muscles are so arranged about the skeleton as to impart to it, by their various contractions, the different movements of which the articulations make it susceptible. Thus far, in the animal structure, all proceeds upon purely mechanical principles. It is simple machinery, the several parts of which act upon one another, in the same manner as the springs and wheels of a watch, or the pistons, levers and valves of a steam engine. We understand perfectly their mode of action, and are able to assign the reason for every one of their particular forms and connections. With a full comprehension of the ends proposed, a thorough acquaintance with the means to be employed for attaining them, and the necessary skill in effecting combinations, we ourselves should form just such a structure. We should add nothing to it; nor could we take anything from it. All human genius, though aided by the experience of six thousand years, has not been able to suggest a single improvement in the structure of man or any of the lower animals.

If we proceed to the other parts of the organization, we find them on the one hand, standing equally in the relation of means to ends, they being each fitted by their endowments for some specific office; and on the other hand, having the same dependence in their modes of action upon the properties of the different kinds of matter entering into their composition. The circulation of the blood, through the agency of the heart and arteries, is conducted on mechanical principles, and governed by mechanical laws, as much as the irrigation of a field by means of ponds and canals. The digestion of food in the stomach, is as much a chemical process as the solution of marble in muriatic acid or the production of alcohol from sugar. The eye is constructed as strictly in accordance with the laws of optics, as the telescope or microscope; and in ministering to vision, it acts upon light in the same manner and by virtue of the same properties. The several parts of the ear are equally adapted in their structure and arrangement to the laws of sound, and in transmitting vibrations from without to the auditory nerve, the organ serves merely as an acoustic instrument. The same thing may be affirmed of numberless other parts of the animal system. We understand perfectly their office, and are able to refer

the endowments by which they are fitted for performing it, to the known laws and properties of matter.

There are other phenomena, however, connected with the living animal, which in the present state of the physical sciences, we cannot so well explain. These, to distinguish them from the former class, have been called the vital phenomena, on the supposition that they depend upon an unknown power, residing in the organization but not belonging to it, denominated the vital principle. There can be little doubt, however, that they are in reality, as entirely the result of organization, and grow as immediately out of the properties of matter and its associated agents, as those exhibited by the eye or the ear, the heart or the stomach. What renders this more probable is, that in proportion as our knowledge of the elements and of their various combinations has advanced, and our acquaintance with the changes actually occurring in the living animal, has become more extended and intimate, many processes which were before regarded as vital, have been brought under the dominion of physical laws. The veil of Isis has been gradually withdrawn, and the impenetrable mysteries which it was supposed to conceal, have under the light of science, resolved themselves, one after another, into the simplest and most ordinary phenomena. The domain of life has, in this way, already been reduced to within comparatively narrow limits, and it is, unquestionably, destined to suffer still further reduction. Indeed there is reason to hope that inquiries already entered upon, may at no distant period lead to discoveries, which shall throw a flood of light upon the most hidden parts of the animal economy, which shall enable us to explain the vital phenomena, by resolving life itself, so long regarded as a mysterious, unknown power, presiding over the mere physical properties of matter, into a simple modification of these properties effected through the influence of organization. If our knowledge of the vital functions be ever enlarged in any such manner as this, then shall we be able to form some just appreciation of the power, wisdom and goodness displayed in the organic creation. Then may we have some adequate conception of the innumerable ends to be secured in the constitution of even the simplest animal, some suitable idea of the profound acquaintance with the properties of matter, and the exhaustless skill and power of contrivance necessary for attaining them.

From our hasty glance at the structure of animals we perceive then, that matter is made use of in their formation, in precisely the manner it should be, on the supposition that it is in truth, what our senses represent it to us, namely, actual substance possessing properties and having various powers and modes of action in consequence of these

properties. On this supposition, our world presents the sublime spectacle of a few simple agents, so combined and employed as to produce the most varied and magnificent results which it is possible for the human mind to conceive. On any other supposition, whether we deny altogether the existence of matter, or admitting its existence, refer the phenomena connected with it, immediately to the power of Deity, the exhibition loses much of its grandeur, and is no longer worthy of our conception of the Divine character. It is as though (if without irreverence we may use the comparison) one should construct with much care, a steam-engine, and when he had finished it, should employ his own strength for moving the piston; or as if, at great cost of materials, labor and skill, he should build a spinning factory, and on its completion should turn with his own hand the spindles.

But this is not all. The argument from the structure of animals may be carried still further. In the organization of every species, numerous cases occur, in which the combinations of matter, necessary to develop in some particular organ, the requisite qualities, develop in that organ at the same time other qualities having no part in its functions, but on the contrary tending directly to impede them. In such instances we frequently find these harmful qualities met and their injurious tendencies counteracted by the provision of a distinct and separate apparatus, attached to the organ in which they are manifested. We have a striking and beautiful illustration of this, in the eye together with its appendages of glands, sacs and ducts. This organ, such is the material of its outer coat or envelope, retains its transparency, only so long as it retains its moisture. The opaqueness which gathers upon it so soon after death, is owing simply to the drying of its surface. During life, the same thing would happen, were there no provision against it. To prevent an occurrence which must prove so fatal to vision, a small gland is placed just over the eye, having for its office the secretion of tears. These, constantly oozing out upon the inside of the upper lid, are conveyed by its rapid passes over the organ to all the exposed parts of its surface. Fresh quantities of moisture are in this manner continually pouring into the eye, to supply the place of that which is lost by evaporation. Thus we perceive that volatility of the tears which belongs to them as essentially as their lubricating and clarifying properties, and which were there no provision against it, would soon render the organ useless, is met and counteracted in its tendencies by the introduction of an additional organ, specially assigned to that office.

Now, on the supposition that matter has a real and separate existence and possesses properties inherent to its substance, we see in this

contrivance for preserving vision, only new proof of the Divine wisdom and benevolence, so clearly manifested in every part of the animal world. On any other supposition the case presents to us the surprising fact of the Creator sustaining by the immediate exercise of his power an injurious quality in the lachrymal fluid and then by the further exercise of his power, preventing the evils that would naturally arise from it.

But the provision for securing the eye against the effects of evaporation do not stop here. If all the tears which are continually flowing in upon the organ, were suffered to dry away on its surface, there would soon be an accumulation of residual matter, consisting of various animal and saline substances. This gradually thickening, and becoming further charged with particles of dust, of which the air always contains a greater or less quantity, would presently induce an inflamed state of the organ, terminating only with its destruction. As a protection against this evil, there is provided a large excess of the lachrymal fluid, over and above what is necessary to supply this evaporation; enough, in fact, to wash the eye and preserve it constantly free from every impurity. But then this excess of fluid must be disposed of. If allowed to accumulate in the eye, until it should flow over the lid, besides the inconvenience of a constant trickling down the cheek, it would in time occasion disease in the eye itself, as we know from experience. To meet this new difficulty, a still further contrivance is resorted to. A very delicate tube is inserted just at the inner angle of the eye, terminating at one extremity in the edges of the lids, and at the other, in the passages of the nose. The tears, as fast as they accumulate, are taken up by this tube, and conveyed to the nose, when, spread over a large surface, they quickly evaporate, and pass off with the other exhalations attendant on respiration. So complex is the lachrymal apparatus, appended to the eye for the express purpose of effecting, what, upon any one of the suppositions of idealism, required only a suspension of the Divine agency.

This, however, is not an isolated case. Numerous instances might be referred to, of a similar character. In fact, there is scarcely any part of the system, in which we do not meet with more or less of this sort of provision. The lymphatic vessels, which arise in great numbers, not only from the serous and mucous surfaces, but also from the deep portions of all the organs, serve only to remove those particles of matter, whose properties have become so changed that they are no longer fit for a place in the organization. These vessels, as well as the veins, are provided at short intervals with valves, designed principally to counteract the influence of gravity in the fluids circulating

through them. Indeed, most of the animal functions, depend upon such a constitution and arrangement of the parts contributing to them as enables these latter to limit, modify, or altogether overcome the ordinary forms of matter.

There is yet another feature in the constitution of animals, which I think has a manifest bearing upon our questions. I refer to the liability of every part of their organization not only to receive injury from various external causes, but also to become disarranged in its action so as no longer to perform in a proper manner its office. Muscles are bruised. Ligaments are torn. Bones are broken. Limbs are severed. The teeth decay. The lungs inflame. The heart enlarges or its valves ossify. The stomach is disordered. The secretions of the liver become obstructed. These and ten thousand other accidents and disorders are incident to our constitution and the circumstances under which we are placed. We cannot, however, on this account suppose them to enter in any way into the real purpose intended to be accomplished by our creation. The privation and suffering attendant upon them, considered as ends, are inconsistent with the benevolence of design so apparent in all the Creator's works. Such an idea is, moreover, wholly irreconcilable with the remedial provisions which we find incorporated, to a greater or less extent, in the structure of all animals; provisions for the reparation of injuries, and the reproduction even, of those parts which have been lost by accident or disease. But if we regard matter as real, and allow to it the possession of inherent and unalterable properties, then we may readily account for the origin and continuance of the different forms of physical evil in a manner perfectly consistent with the Divine goodness, and also entirely reconcilable with the provisions made in so many instances for remedying them. They will then be seen to grow immediately out of the constitution of matter, to arise necessarily from the nature of the materials of which organic beings are composed, and from which they derive all their powers. These evils therefore always have existed and always will exist. Matter continuing what it is, the beings formed of it must be liable to injury; and in proportion as their organizations are complex, and the influences acting upon them variable, they must be liable to disorder. This is a fundamental condition of every form of organic existence, and the animal kingdom, as we might naturally expect, is constituted through all its parts, in strict accordance with it. Among the lowest races, we find animals with structures so simple, that they are scarcely more liable to disorder, than the elements of which they are formed. As their faculties are proportionably limited, they have little power of avoiding danger, and

are consequently peculiarly exposed to mutilation and injury. As a compensation for this, they are endowed (the simplicity of their structure admitting it) with the most astonishing powers of recovery; entire limbs, and in some instances the eyes even, being reproduced in a short time after they have been lost. As we rise in the scale of organized being, we meet with animals of a more complex structure, possessing a wider range of faculties, and having greater power of avoiding the dangers by which they are surrounded. These suffer less frequently in the integrity of their parts. Their power of repairing injuries and supplying losses when such occur, is also less remarkable. At the same time, they are more liable to disease, on account of the greater number and delicacy of the relations subsisting between their several parts, and the vis medicatrix naturae, it would seem, is also stronger with them, owing, it is probable, to the same cause. We have this type of character most strongly exemplified in man, who stands at the head of the organic creation and who besides combining in his structure a greater number and variety of parts, than any other animal, is also endowed with intellectual and moral faculties, which add still further to the elaborateness of his constitution. His life is also more varied and takes in a far wider range, both of character and of circumstances, than that of any other animal. We accordingly find him more liable to disease, oftener suffering from organic or fundamental derangement. At the same time his system, including within it more numerous checks and balances, possesses greater recuperative powers; so that disorders, though more various and more frequent, do not so generally prove fatal with him, as with the lower animals.

Now all this, we say, is not only perfectly reconcilable with the goodness of Deity, but furnishes a new and beautiful illustration of it, if we suppose the properties of matter to be inherent and unalterable. The liability to suffer from injury and disease, growing immediately out of these properties, belongs necessarily to every form of organic life. Vegetables are no more exempt from it than animals. The evils naturally arising from it may be in various ways checked and limited, but they cannot be altogether prevented even by the wisest and most benevolent provisions. They are incidental to our existence as organized beings and no degree of care or attention on our part can enable us wholly to avoid them. They are however only incidental. We do not find them aimed at and provided for. There is nothing to indicate that they are in any manner objects of the Divine intention.

But if on the contrary we suppose the phenomena connected with matter, to be immediately dependent upon the power of God, we must

then refer these evils directly to his will, and suppose them to be as really and as fully intended by him, as any of the most obvious ends of our creation; an idea not only contradicted by everything which we behold around us, but one from which our whole moral nature revolts; for it makes God responsible for the evil in the world, not as inseparably connected with the means employed for the production of a greater amount of good but as existing by itself and for its own sake.

There is one other point of view from which we would glance at our subject before dismissing it. Simplicity is one of the most striking characteristics of the Creator's works. It is found everywhere and pervades everything; so true is this, that any theory, whether in morals or physics, which falls in this attribute may be presumed from that circumstance alone to be without foundation in nature. Now if we apply this test to the hypothesis we have been considering, there can be no question which of the two should be preferred. One refers the changes continually going on in the natural world, to the action of a few elements; deducing from their various properties all its most complicated phenomena. It supposes results transcending in variety and magnificence our powers of conception, to be brought about by means so simple, that a child may comprehend them. It presents in the different kinds of matter, considered with reference to the purposes for which they were formed, a sublime generalization of constitutions and powers, of which every advance in the physical sciences, gives us only a more exalted conception.

The other hypothesis refers the same phenomena immediately to the power of the Deity. It supposes that power to be exerted every moment about each one of all the innumerable atoms contained in the universe. Nay more. It requires that the power of Deity should everywhere attend these atoms; that it should follow them through all their combinations and changes, varying its manifestation with every new condition under which they are placed. The idea which is thus presented of the Divine agency in the natural world, is intricate and involved, beyond the power of language to express. The mind even is pained and bewildered in its efforts to take it in. It is wholly wanting in that beautiful simplicity which, as we have said, characterizes all the operations of nature. It cannot therefore be true.

The foregoing considerations are, we think, sufficient to justify us in regarding as false every supposition which requires the interposition of Divine power in the production of material phenomena. Matter is a reality. It possesses properties and acts by virtue of those properties. It is in truth what our senses affirm it to be. Their testimony is to be regarded as having equal authority with the voice of

inspiration. It comes from the Author of nature and is strengthened and confirmed by all that we know of His character, and by all that we learn of His works. It is more especially in perfect accordance with the manner in which he has employed matter in framing our globe and in organizing the different tribes of plants and animals placed upon it.

In concluding our remarks upon the relations of matter to Deity, it may be proper to advert very briefly to the question of its origin. Whence is it? Has it always existed, or were the spaces now filled with it, once unoccupied and void? Are we to regard it as eternal and self-existent? Or shall we suppose it to have had a beginning, and to have derived its existence from a power without itself? The question, if we mistake not, is one upon which, aside from revelation, we have no means of forming an opinion. It lies wholly beyond the reach of our faculties. It is one of those questions which the human mind naturally and instinctively asks, but to which she gains no answer either from within or from without. Considered abstractly, the reason does not take hold of it; as a question of fact, there are no analogies bearing upon it. It is true that matter is employed by the Creator as if it already existed, and was, if we may so speak, furnished to His hands. It is taken just as it is. Its properties are made use of, but not modified. Even when the most complex arrangements and combinations are necessary to attain a proposed end in accordance with its laws, these latter are not changed, but the combinations and arrangements are uniformly resorted to. In a word, as we have already seen, matter is employed by God in the same manner as we ourselves should employ it for like purposes. This fact however affords no just ground for the inference that it was not originally created by Him. Having formed it and endowed it with properties, we should naturally expect that He would make use of it in such a manner as to make these properties available to the purposes of its creation. Any alteration of them, the resort in any emergency to new elements or new properties would imply either defect in the constitution of matter or want of skill in employing it. We can therefore gain no indications from this source in regard to its origin.

The vast scale upon which matter exists, the sublime ends to which it ministers, as well as the ceaseless round of changes through which it is constantly passing, without itself undergoing change or diminution naturally impress upon the mind the idea of permanence, and it is not surprising that those who derived their light solely from nature should generally have believed it to be eternal. Such appears to have been the opinion of the ancient Egyptian philosophers. They were

accustomed to trace the world back, through a series of transformations to an original chaos, in which the materials composing it already existed, though enveloped in profound darkness, and without relation, order or end. In this state they believed matter to be coëval with God, and limited the work of creation to educing from its chaotic elements the beauty, arrangement and harmony of the universe. These cosmological ideas, although originating on the banks of the Nile, like many other of the Egyptian doctrines, passed over to Greece and Italy where they were incorporated, with slight alterations, into the prevailing mythological and philosophical systems. The highest conception of Deity which seems to have been formed on either side of the Mediterranean, was that of a Power intimately pervading all matter and continually evolving from it life, motion, order and beauty.

> " Coelum, ac terras, camposque liquentes
> Lucentemque globum Lunae, Titaniaque astra
> Spiritus intus alit, totamque infusa per artus
> Mens agitat molem et magno se corpore miscet.
> Inde hominum pecudumque genus vitaeque volantum,
> Et quae marmoreo fert monstra sub aequore pontus."

For the sublime idea of a Being, who was able by the simple exertion of His power to give existence to matter, " who spake and it was done, who commanded and it stood fast," who said, " Let there be light and there was light," we are indebted to the Hebrew Scriptures. Dictated originally by inspiration, the idea has come down to us through the channel of these writings, along with other conceptions of the Divine character, as far surpassing in grandeur anything we find in heathen mythologies. No speculations introduce it. No arguments are offered in support of it. But the doctrine is made to rest upon the only foundation capable of sustaining it, the word of God. It is presented to us as a revealed truth, which we have no natural means of ascertaining, which the Author of all things could alone have made known to us.

ARTICLE VIII.

THE ADVANCEMENT OF SOCIETY IN KNOWLEDGE AND VIRTUE.

By Prof. B. B. Edwards.

THE Christian philanthropist, when he casts his eye on the history of the world, or on its present condition, is apt to be despondent. If he be not conscious of this feeling on a cursory view, he may awake to the sad reality on a further examination. In proportion, indeed, as he is a true man, cordially devoted to the best interests of his fellow creatures, he will be sustained by the goodness of his cause. The arm of the faithful soldier is nerved mainly by the justice of his cause. In the darkest hours, he is cheered by the consciousness that he is contending for the true interests of his country. Still, the moral strength of an army consists very much in the degree in which they expect success. Sometimes victory is taken for granted. All the previous arrangements are made with a distinct understanding that there will be a favorable result. To each division of the host is assigned the duty of following up the victory and of reaping all its possible fruits. In such cases a defeat is nearly impossible. A triumph is generally certain where it is confidently expected. So in the spiritual warfare. The Christian philanthropist, who commences his work with the cheerful anticipation of success, will commonly win his object. A hopeful frame of spirit is one of God's best gifts to man. A morbid anticipation of defeat, or of small success, is followed almost always by the expected result.

But in proportion as one is fitted to his particular work by an enlightened education, by enlarged views of the dispensation of grace which is committed to him, by a fraternal interest for his brethren elsewhere, by compassion for a world which must perish without the light of revelation, he will derive encouragement from the general spread of Christianity, or become faint-hearted from the prevalence of sin and error. His success as an individual will be very much in proportion to his expectation of the universal triumph of the Redeemer. If animated by the great hopes which should fill his bosom, he will perform his work with an energy and authority which is possible in no other circumstances. If he looks with a despairing or indifferent eye on the mass of mankind, he will be apt to do so on the

members of his own little circle. If he has made up his mind to surrender the race to irreversible destruction, he will be likely to show little energy in his own sphere of duty. In other words, one of the principal elements of success in individual effort anywhere, is the expectation that there will be progress everywhere. The personal aim, the individual, local hope, are linked invincibly with the great final result.

What are the grounds for hope that the cause in which the true philanthropist is engaged will ultimately triumph?

1. Our confidence in the power of the Holy Spirit. All obstacles before Him are as the chaff of the threshing floor. Opposing governments hoary with despotism, or rank with socialism, will sink in his presence like lead in the mighty waters. He understands the thousand avenues to the human soul, and can fit his instruments to his purpose with unerring precision.

2. The predictions of the Scriptures. Unless we mistake their interpretation, they announce the Saviour's universal reign. Their abrupt transitions, their gorgeous and daring imagery only make the desired consummation the more sure. Couched beneath these metaphors, there is a breadth and affluence of meaning, which no partial gospel triumph can exhaust. The sublime imagination of the Hebrew prophet was not divinely illumined to pierce the tract of ages in order to foreshow a confined and momentary triumph. Even should the ancient prediction have this limited and local application, we have a firm resting-place in the declaration that the fulness of the Gentiles shall come in and so all Israel be saved, uttered, be it remembered, *after* the day of Pentecost, after the gospel had been preached, through mighty signs and wonders, from Jerusalem, round about unto Illyricum. The vision is for an appointed time, though it tarry, wait for it; it will surely come, it will not tarry.

3. The fitness of the remedy to the disease,—the perfect adaptation of the gospel to the woes and depravity of man. It addresses itself in a manner possible only to its Divine author, to all the susceptibilities and powers, the hopes, fears and aspirations, to all the feelings of doubt and despair which lodge in man's bosom. It is not an arbitrary arrangement. The preaching of the gospel is foolishness only in the view of perverted reason and of a corrupted taste. It includes the elements of the highest wisdom, the most admirable fitness of means to the end.

4. The success which has already attended the dispensation of the gospel. Its sway over mankind is yet, indeed, very imperfect and limited. The mass of men, even in Christian lands, still reject its authority and live without its hopes. But it has accomplished enough

to show what it can do. It has been tested in all departments of society. It has had its triumphs in every region of intellectual power —of polished or of hardened depravity. If it reaches Pascal and Newton, then there is no genius or science which it may not purify and exalt. If it can create a nation of Christians out of Sandwich Islanders or South Africans, it has power to redeem every tribe that needs its light. Its influence is not universal, it is not general, but it has shown its capability;—its power to solve the hardest problems of degenerate nature. It has been tried in a thousand balances and never found wanting. If it can conquer one district of paganism, it can subjugate the world.

5. But there is another ground of encouragement which we especially wish to consider in the present discussion—that is, the general state of the world.

Leaving out of the account the church of Christ, the institutions of Christianity, and all direct efforts for the spread of the gospel, is the general aspect of the world one of discouragement or of hope? As we look through the great volume of history, what report have we to make? When we survey the long ages, as they stretch off into a dim antiquity, are we animated with hope or filled with forebodings? Is the Providence of God coöperating with his gospel in gradually leading the entire race to holiness and salvation? Or is God seen in history only as restraining what else would be intolerable depravity, or as an avenging Deity, laying bare his punitive arm?

There are only three possible theories on this subject. It is assumed by some that the world has been and is becoming gradually worse, that all supposed melioration is only on the surface, that the current of depravity is constantly running deeper and broader, that a funeral pall is by degrees extending over this once fair creation, that men will sin with a higher hand and a bolder face till some miraculous and dreadful catastrophe shall engulf them, introductory perhaps to a new order of things when the saints shall possess the earth and the tabernacle of God shall be literally with men. The only exception to this dark picture is the little Goshen where the people of God abide. As we do not know who the elect are that are to be gathered in, we are to proclaim the gospel to all whom our voice can reach, yet with small expectation of success. This might be called the discouraging or hopeless theory.

Another theory teaches that the world is in a state of perpetual vacillation; there are vibrations of hope and of despair; the earth is now verging towards the light, then is shrouded in darkness; there is a constant flux and reflux; empires rise and fall, but no progress is made.

Generations come and disappear, but the world is no wiser or better. All things continue as they have continued from the beginning. We can predict neither the redemption nor the destruction of the world. Uncertainty rests on all things. It is a confused mixture of good and evil, in which we can discern no positive elements, no great tendencies in either direction. All which we can say is, that the waves advance and then recede. It may be called the theory of *indifferentism*, sometimes of atheism.

The only remaining supposition is, that the world is gradually becoming better; that on the whole some progress has been making towards a brighter era. The change may be often exceedingly slow and nearly imperceptible. Light struggles with the darkness and sometimes seems to suffer total eclipse, but ultimately the cloud disappears. Knowledge, truth, virtue, civilization, are more and more distinctly recognized and highly prized. Apart from the church of Christ, separate from all direct religious influence, may we not be cheered with the hope, if not with the absolute belief, that the Providence of God in history is working out the same merciful design that the grace of God is in the church? Must we look upon the world, as destined, in its present order, to certain destruction, or as balancing to and fro, in inextricable confusion, or as giving indications, not to be mistaken, of a better destiny?

That the more hopeful interpretation is the true one, might be made probable at least, if not evident, by three distinct lines of argument or three classes of facts.

We might appeal, in the first place, to the existing state of the world, and show that there were never so many grounds for encouragement as at the present moment. There are certain auspicious changes, some of which go to the foundations of society. The rights of conscience were never so well understood nor so extensively respected. The distinction between the church and the State is more clearly defined and correctly appreciated. The rights of the vast mass, the lower classes, are not trampled under foot with the same proud disdain as formerly. Kings and cabinets are compelled to entertain the idea, that the legitimate object of government is to promote the real well being of the people. On no other theory can they retain their sceptres. Mere promises of reform are now of no avail. The days of court-favoritism and of peculiar aristocratic privilege are coming rapidly to an end. Moral and intellectual worth are beginning to assume their true position. The great science of humanity is more profoundly studied and its laws more sacredly observed. Penal codes, criminal legislation, and all that vast system of statutes, written and unwritten,

affecting the morals and manners of society, are undergoing most salutary changes. It would be impossible now to rebuild the dungeons of Olmutz, or of the Bastile, or of Newgate. The ear of despotism *is* reached by the voice of outraged humanity. Secresy—that worst attribute of tyranny—cannot be maintained. Now, these considerations are not invalidated by the fact that they are attended with partial evils, or by the assertion that they are counterbalanced by corresponding mischiefs. No one, it is presumed, would exchange, leaving Christianity out of the account, our own existing New England for that of the pilgrim fathers, or for the boasted old England of the seventeenth century, or for the Germany of the Reformers. In three hundred years there has been an immeasurable advance in points vitally affecting society, touching not simply its branches, but its trunk and its roots.

Another line of argument would consist in selecting some prominent events in the history of the church, and showing how they have exerted salutary effects on the world, which nothing has been able to counteract or destroy. The Protestant Reformation, for example, has impressed its character on the political world as truly as on the religious. It created in a sense a language and literature which are more influential than any, with perhaps a single exception. It breathed its genius and religious spirit into dialects spoken by sixty or seventy millions of men. It has left its witness in the hearts and memories of multitudes, a veneration for the author of that Reformation, an almost passionate affection for him which may contribute at length to lead them into the same path of holiness and truth. But its effects did not end with Germany. It awakened the human mind, so that it has never been able to slumber since. It engraved, as with an iron pen, the great doctrine of personal responsibility in the relations of man to man, as well as of man to his Creator. No perversions of this great event, no failures to carry out its principles, have been able to stay its influence, or efface its impressions. All Europe, politically and socially, is in a state essentially different and essentially better, than she was before the Reformation. In a thousand forms, it has pervaded society, and if not always with healing power, yet really and substantially so.

Some of these remarks are applicable to the religious movements of the present day. Their indirect, earthly benefits are not among their least. Foreign missions, missions in our own country, the distribution of the Bible, are constantly exerting a wider and happier influence upon those who take no part in the work and may never share in its saving influence. In proportion as Christians truly exhibit the spirit of their Master, being one with another as he is one with the

Father, copying his sublime example of benevolence, the world will be benefitted, temporally, if not spiritually; a salutary fear of a moral Governor and of an avenging Providence will more or less pervade society. Christianity thus becomes the salt, if not the salvation of the world. The mass of men are brought into a better and more hopeful state. It is impossible for the Christian religion to be exhibited in its true character of enlarged philanthropy, without insinuating its healthful influence through a thousand secret channels.

But there is another great class of events or facts, to which we would more particularly allude, and which, as it seems to us, conspire to the same end. These events or phenomena occur in civil society, separate from all the direct influences of Christianity. Do they, or do they not, coöperate with it? Is their influence, on the whole, and taking *long* periods of time, favorable to the gradual melioration of the race? They are secular in their character. Are they conservative or destructive in their effects? In other words, has the Providence of God been working in universal history with some great, ultimate, benevolent design? All acknowledge that the events which occurred among those tribes and nations bordering on the ancient Jews, were controlled or overruled so as to accomplish the purposes of God in relation to his church. The political condition of the Roman empire, at the introduction of Christianity, was shaped by Him who had given to his Son the heathen for an inheritance. Does this divine, yet not miraculous, interference extend beyond those nations immediately contiguous to the church—to those events which seem to have no connection with it? Is this shaping Providence universal, and is its great tendency in past times and at present towards the redemption of the race? Partial catastrophes, the destruction of a particular nation or race do not decide this question in the negative. They may be necessary attendant evils, a small part of the dealings of Him who is excellent in counsel and wonderful in working. To read *his* ways aright, we must not confine ourselves to single, detached events, or brief periods. We must select those occurrences which have had ample room for development, or whose magnitude have impressed themselves indelibly on the world.

To prevent misconception, two or three preliminary remarks are needed.

The first is, that all these events, or the general course of Providence as manifested in history, are acknowledged to be entirely inadequate to save the world. It is the direct influence of the gospel only which can convert the individual or regenerate society.

It may be inquired further, if the immediate agency of the gospel

be left out of the account, what auxiliary powers are to be found? What beneficial agency is at work in society coöperating in a greater or less degree with Revelation?

It may be answered that there are various influences, emanating from a Divine revelation, that have diffused themselves far and wide. No eye but the Omniscient can trace their secret history. It is possible that no realm of paganism is so dark, but that some straggling ray has reached it. Again, some of the events that occur in history, separate from all mediate or immediate influence of the gospel, are salutary in their own nature. Others may be the reverse, positively injurious. A single event may have qualities or aspects which are benign; others which are malignant. By a secret, overruling Providence, both classes are made to subserve a benevolent purpose. One is guided along its natural channel; the other is counteracted and impelled to subserve ends foreign to its nature. The wrath of man is either restrained, or made to praise the Lord.

The question, stated in other words, is this: Does it appear that the Gospel, in the present order of things, is to be gradually yet not miraculously extended till it shall become universal, or does it appear that its influence is becoming more and more limited to those whom it has now actually saved and to a few besides, while, on the other hand, the mass of mankind are coming less and less under its influence and are gradually filling up the measure of their iniquities? It seems to us, that an impartial view of history, a consideration of the general course of Divine Providence, in past ages and at the present time, will lead us to cherish encouraging anticipations.

And here it may be remarked, that it is not necessary to extenuate any of the evils that afflict society. Many of them are radical and enormous. The records of history, as history has been commonly written, awaken the saddest remembrances, and excite in some minds little else but the most melancholy forebodings. It is a common impression that the profoundest students of human nature and of history will be least likely to indulge in favorable anticipations of the destiny of the race, and that it is only the superficial observer who can discern auspicious omens. But it is possible and not uncommon to err through the influence of despondent or morbid feelings, and to interpret every event according to certain individual or subjective views and impressions. That conclusion only should be admitted which is the result of a dispassionate, honest and comprehensive examination.

I. The first fact which we shall mention is the influence of the civilization and culture of the ancient Greeks.

We are not about to fall into the current strain of eulogizing the Greeks, as if it were by their own wisdom, by the might of their own arm, that they have been enabled so vitally to affect subsequent ages. It was God who wrought through them. It was not fortune or accident which hung above them those serene skies, which tempered their delicious climate, which multiplied in land and sea, on island and mountain, all the forms of beauty. It was the inspiration of the Almighty which breathed into them that soul, exquisite in its structure, those sensibilities quivering with life, that fine, apprehensive faculty never granted to man elsewhere in equal degree. It was God who attuned the ear so perfectly. It was an extraordinary combination of Providential circumstances which fitted to each other the organ and its modulated symbol. All these wonderful gifts were not for their own fame, to illustrate their own brief national history. It was for the good of the world. They have become, without in general intending it, the teachers of the race. The culture, of which under God, they were the authors, has become incorporated with all modern learning, with all refined sentiment, with the manners and habits of nations.

Let us be more specific, and take the idea of beauty, in form, in speech, in sentiment, in thinking, in action. The coarse polytheism has passed away, but this remains. Quarrelling Olympus has long since utterly lost its hold on mankind, yet this element of beauty still subsists in undiminished freshness. We cannot always see its progress, but we can evermore discern its effects.

A snow falls in the winter in a little valley in one of the Alpine summits. In the Spring and Summer it melts and disappears, but it is not lost; it waters the root of a lily many leagues away; it fertilizes the garden of a poor peasant hundreds of miles in the opposite direction; it makes the retired valley sing for joy—or it is the cold water which refreshes the thirsty traveller; then it cheerfully casts in its mites to help bear away the gains of a prosperous commerce. We cannot count the benefits of which it is made the rejoicing yet unconscious instrument. So of that element of thought and culture to which we refer. However commingled it may be with other ingredients, however invisible in some stages of its progress, its agency is still felt and is one of the most important in the higher departments of modern civilization. It may be subtle, intangible, apparently evanescent, but on that very account the more operative. How do we obtain our idea of the natural beauty of the Divine character? By transferring to it all the ideas of beauty which we possess and all which we can imagine. The quality in God is fixed and has a permanent value, but in

our minds it is capable of indefinite enlargement. The loftier our ideal is, the more cultivated our minds are, the more abundant the analogies and symbols of beauty which we possess, the worthier will be our conceptions of Him who is the source of all beauty.

Another great and enduring product of Greek culture results from the symmetrical and comprehensive education which the Greeks taught and attained. The Creator endued the mind with various powers, and thus indicated his will that they should be unfolded harmoniously and form a perfect being. The perversion of this Divine arrangement has caused a thousand melancholy evils. It is often the defective, ill-shaped, one-sided intellect that occasions remediless evils. A great design of the Gospel, perhaps its most prominent indirect effect, is to reïntroduce harmony into these disordered faculties. With this tendency of his word, his Providence strikingly coöperated in the case before us. That intellectual people, whom He designed to be the teachers of the race, the lawgivers in human culture, laid the utmost stress upon this consentaneous and equal development of the human understanding. They taught it in theory, they exemplified it in practice; they insisted upon it as the only true model; they declared that in this way only, man could recover the image of his Maker; their highest idea of divine perfection was a sweet, untroubled accordance of all the moral and intellectual powers; they denounced as folly and sin all exclusive training of one or two faculties. The absorption of the soul in one idea or one pursuit, they looked upon as a species of madness.

This great lesson has not been without its effect. Wherever human culture has been conformed to the design of the Creator, or wherever the true idea of education shall be fully reached, it was and it will be essentially owing to the myriad-minded educators whom the Divine Spirit so endowed on the shores of the Ægean.

We may be allowed to refer to another influence from Greek culture that has affected fundamentally the condition of mankind, that is, personal freedom, taken in connection with another elementary truth, that there can be no political independence without morality, that politics must have sound principle as its basis. The doctrine of the real, substantive worth of the individual is fully taught in the Bible, even in the Old Testament. The soul that sinneth, *it* shall die. This was reässerted and practically maintained, even unto death, by the Greeks. In other regions, in Rome especially, all things were merged in the State. The individual was nothing, the political body was everything. But a man has a will, a conscience, a sense of inalienable right; he must appear in person before the great tribunal of law and of justice; there-

fore he cannot be made the tool of a despotism or of a priesthood; this was the Athenian doctrine, taught by her great historians, reïterated in words of fire by her orator, and tested in a thousand forms by her people. This is becoming the doctrine of mankind; it was exemplified by Luther before Charles V, by John Huss, outside of the walls of Constance, begirt with flames, restated by John Hampden at Whitehall and by the pilgrims at Plymouth. Other ingredients were doubtless intermingled; but the classic element was efficient and vital. It is the prompter to heroic deeds and disinterested suffering.

The other lesson, which should never be dissociated, the world has been less ready to learn. The doctrine that "all is fair in politics" is not of Grecian origin. The spirit which breathes through the writings of the great dramatists and philosophers is conservative and anti-radical. The structure of politics, it would build on the eternal foundations of right and of justice. Nothing, it maintains, is expedient which is not true and good. It would make no distinction between a politician and a statesman—a statesman and a virtuous man. Civil government has its archetype—its great exemplar in the Divine. Order should be man's first law, as it is Heaven's. Deeply imbedded in all true theories and forms of government is the fixed idea of right.[1] High over all temporary expedients and arbitrary fashions reigns a rewarding or avenging Deity. The opposite doctrine, which confounds moral distinctions, and which the apostle Paul so indignantly denounced, was not Greek wisdom, it was parasitic, an after-growth, an excresence, not the teaching of the immortal poets and philosophers of Greece. Wherever the true doctrine has reäppeared, as it does in the pages of Edmund Burke, the germ, the original source, the guiding lines of argument, may be traced to the sages of the Academy.

II. Coming down a few centuries, we select another great event—the overrunning of the Roman empire by the people of the North—the predominance of the Gothic race in Europe. Never perhaps did

---

[1] Pythagoras would make the external life dependent on the inward; civil freedom on that of noble sentiment; the administration of a State on the intellectual cultivation of the citizens; the prosperity of a city on the purity of morals.—*Schwarz Erziehungslehre*, I. p. 313. According to Plato, a State that would attain to the highest perfection must be administered by those who, in the common judgment of wise men, are the best citizens. These, beholding the beauty of virtue, not only admire and love it, but pursue and cherish it with the utmost earnestness. In directing both their own life and the affairs of the State, they follow in all things the heavenly pattern.—*De Repub.* L. V. "Those, who would undertake the highest offices of State, must possess three qualities—first, love to the existing government; second, the highest fitness for the duties of their office; and thirdly, virtue and justice."—*Aristot. Polit.* V. 14.

an event happen in civil history that seemed more providential, or that was attended with larger, and as we can thus far judge, with happier consequences. Some other contingencies were possible; one or two of them were perhaps more probable than that event which actually happened. Europe might have been overrun with Islamism as a large part of Spain was. It seemed to be several times in imminent hazard. Italy was long and sorely menaced; the Saracen was thundering at the gates of Vienna; his hordes were ravaging the fairest fields of France. They might have gained a temporary footing and been ultimately driven out as the Moors were from Spain, yet leaving their gloomy fanaticism and haughty arrogance enstamped on the European mind as it is now on the Spanish character; or the Roman empire might have declined some ages longer, its powers nearly worn out, a counterpart of what the nations of central Asia have been for centuries, finally becoming the prey of some fierce barbarian.

But God, in his wonder-working Providence, had decreed otherwise. In his wise arrangement, the race had been training in the stern climates of the North, which in due time took possession of the old seats of civilization. Through the predominance of this race two great results have been effected. It has imparted vigor, physical, intellectual and moral to nearly all Christendom. Energy is its characteristic distinction. Vitality it has breathed into every department of science and literature. With some partial exceptions, the entire race has been for ages nearly stationary or else languishing and ready to die, except so far as it has sprung from northern Europe, or been reïnforced from thence. The evidences of its power and skill are in almost every land, its life on every sea; the islands are literally waiting for its laws. It is true that this enormous energy is abused and becomes the instrument of atrocious crimes. This, however, is a perversion and not its natural tendency. It is the ally of good and honorable enterprises. We never look for a flourishing state of religion and morals in those communities which are characterized by decay and inertia. The nations that are not prosperous will as a general thing be degenerate in morals. Poverty is often the parent of dejection, discontent, envy, and open crime.

Another great effect of this supremacy of the northern nations of Europe is apparent in the department of morals and manners. Much of that purity of social intercourse, that true delicacy of feeling, that high-minded regard for the female sex, that observance of the general laws of decorum, which characterize the Germanic and Anglo-Saxon races, did characterize their ancestors two thousand years ago. Vices

they had; many daring crimes they committed; but they possessed that chivalric sense of honor, those virtuous sensibilities in the domestic relations, whose influences, now conjoined with and enforced by Christian principles, have become the permanent characteristics of great nations. The irresistible physical force of these Northmen has been tempered with kindness to the weak and unresisting; the intellectual power with which they grapple with the great questions of politics and morals is softened and made attractive by the nameless graces of refined feeling and just sentiment. Mohammed and his immediate followers could handle the sword with desperate bravery, but to all the finer feelings they were necessarily strangers, because they regarded one half of the race as unworthy or incapable of intellectual and moral culture. The Moslems were unfitted for any benevolent design of Providence, because in addition to the false faith of which they were devotees, they lacked the true sources and elements of social elevation and refinement.

III. We will advert to but one more event in civil history—the first French Revolution. Though this is of recent occurrence, yet it was of such magnitude, so immediate and so vast in its results, that we can now, in a great measure determine its influence. That influence, on the whole, must be regarded as beneficial. To this conviction, it is thought, we shall come whatever may be our opinion of the character of the great actors in it, or of him who finally controlled it. We may adopt the extreme British view, the one generally entertained in New England in 1812, or the one which is accepted in France, or any intermediate theory. Still, that preponderating good has resulted, either directly, or by the wise counteraction and shaping of Providence, cannot be denied. It is obvious both on the face and in the depths of European society. It is acknowledged now by men of the most enlightened and conservative views in those continental countries which suffered most severely from its temporary, destructive effects. Indeed it is fast coming to be, if it be not at the present moment, the opinion of the greater number who are most impartial and most competent to decide. Those who are accustomed to regard the French Revolution as an event of great and unmixed evil, do not sufficiently ponder its causes. That event was as inevitable as anything moral can be. No earthly power could stay it. That black and heavy tide which broke over every barrier and dike in 1793, had been accumulating for centuries. The night longest to be remembered for its unutterable atrocity was that following St. Bartholomew's eve in 1572. The age of preëminent wickedness in France was that of Louis XIV. The secret passages, the little closets, and the splendid halls of the

palace at Versailles could tell tales of wickedness which no public square or prison in Paris could rival.[1] In short the oppression to which the mass of the French people had been subjected, could not be borne a moment longer. The great day of God's wrath and their deliverance had come. The terrible disease demanded a terrible remedy. The pestilence which overspread the court and the nobility could be purged with nothing less than fire.

Has the purification been effected? Has the storm cleansed the moral and political atmosphere of Europe?

First, Romanism received a blow from which it has never recovered. It was this system in its root and essence—Jesuitism, which was leagued with the court and the *noblesse* against the liberties of the people. It has not, it never can, regain its lost dominion in France. At the time of the Revolution, the number of ecclesiastics in the Roman Catholic church was 114,000; now, with an increase of one-third in population, there are but 42,000; their revenues have decreased from 142,000,000 of francs to 36,000,000. A great number of monasteries and other ecclesiastical establishments have been suppressed, and what was more important than all—the infallibility of the church—the haughty idea of her inviolable sanctity, was exposed to a practical contempt from which the church can hardly recover. Though she has made some fresh efforts to regain her lost honors, she can never succeed, because she is compelled more or less to go through the ordeal of an enlightened public, if not Protestant opinion.

Second, the Revolution effectually broke up that secresy in which the proceedings of courts and civil tribunals were conducted, with which crimes were frequently committed, and in which horrible punishments were inflicted. It poured in the light of Heaven on the cells of suffering humanity and on the dark abodes of vice. One-half of the severity of punishment often consisted in the mystery which hung over it. This great engine of superstition and cruelty was destroyed in a large part of Europe. While the Revolution demolished the inquisition in Spain, it opened to the public gaze civil and judicial proceedings in many countries of the Continent.

Third, it changed the whole interior condition of France; it annulled the feudal system; abolished the rights of primogeniture; appor-

[1] "The vices of the court," says Richelieu, "inundated the capital and the whole kingdom with much more fatal force than its pleasures. They infected even foreign courts and nations. Invisible vices still lurked in concealment, and were aggravated by universal hypocrisy. The novelists of the age imagined it impossible to make much further advances in depravity. The prodigious corruption of morals at the court of Louis XIV. first manifested itself by the excesses in which most of the princesses of the royal family indulged."

tioned the soil to small proprietors,[1] put law in the place of arbitrary prescription, equality in the room of privilege; delivered men from the distinctions of caste, and substituted in place of hoary abuses a state of things more conformed to justice and better fitted to modern manners.

Fourth. It planted or quickened the germ of representative and free governments for all Europe. Many of the continental countries would not consent to reïnstate their hereditary princes on their thrones, till they had extorted from them the promise of establishing a coördinate branch of the government in which the voice of the people should be heard. This promise, till within a very recent period, has been indeed tardily fulfilled. But it has been impossible to prevent the extension of the system. The example is contagious. Russia cannot wholly crush these fermenting principles of freedom. Every step she takes in the great modern enterprise of effecting intercommunication among her provinces, is exposing her to the danger she so much dreads, is bringing her into the very focus of those influences set in motion by the French Revolution, into close contact with the freest and most decidedly Protestant nations of Christendom. In short this Revolution has effected, and is effecting, throughout Europe, a general improvement, physical, intellectual and moral.[2] Its chief actor constructed pathways, which shall last as long as the mountains which they pierce, or the rivers that they span. And these are but types of the greater changes which are taking place in society and in the church. Institutions, that have rested principally on immemorial usage or prescriptive right, are crumbling in pieces; childish superstitions, which have fettered whole tribes and nations for a thousand years, are secretly despised, or openly rejected.

The astonishing changes which have occurred during the present

[1] In 1818, it was estimated that there were 10,414,121 properties in France. On the supposition that more than one property may occasionally belong to one proprietor, the number of individual proprietors may be 4,833,000; and as most of these are heads of families, which may on an average consist of five persons, the total class of proprietors of land may be stated at 14,479,830, about half the population of France.—*MacKinnon's Civilization, II. p.* 62.

[2] It has been stated that, during the short period that the French remained in Egypt, they left manifold traces of amelioration; and that, if they could have established their power, Egypt would now be comparatively civilized. Many intelligent Spaniards have expressed regret that the French failed to retain their dominion in Spain. The same remarks, substantially, have been made by intelligent Germans. The question of the auspicious effects of this Revolution, it may be again stated, is entirely distinct from that which relates to the motives and many of the acts of the authors of it. It is the prerogative of Providence to educe good from evil. The intentions of the agent may be wholly reprehensible, while he is made the unwilling instrument of accomplishing great and permanent good.

year, and which may mark the history of Europe for some time, will not, it is thought, invalidate or annul the arguments which have been adduced. It is true that the greater part of the population of Continental Europe are ignorant and superstitious, while no inconsiderable portion of those individuals who are enlightened, entertain skeptical opinions, or theories inconsistent with the well-being of society. Proudly disdaining the lights of experience and the precepts of the Bible, they would reconstruct society on principles utterly at variance with all true progress.

Still, it should be remembered that many of the most enlightened friends of liberty and improvement in Italy, Germany, and other countries, have learned the lessons of moderation, as well as of progress, of the necessity of uniting caution with zeal, of laboring, if possible, with existing governments, rather than against them, so that thus they may acquire a moral force which shall be irresistible.

Again, it should not be forgotten that, during the long interval of peace since 1815, extended efforts have been made with the happiest results, to spread the gospel and its institutions in many parts of the continent. An efficient instrumentality has been at work in France. Many enlightened and able Protestants have contributed, in various ways, to place that interesting country in a much more favorable, moral position than that which she occupied forty years ago. Whatever of conservative and Christian influence exists in any part of the world is now made to bear quickly and efficiently on every other part. This consideration makes an immeasurable difference in our moral estimate of the actors in the French Revolution of 1793, and of those of 1848. There is, also, at the present time, a powerful middle class in France and in every other civilized country, whose pecuniary interests are altogether in favor of maintaining order and obedience to law. This commercial class is very powerful, is pledged to the maintenance of peace, and is necessarily hostile to all radical theories in respect to the division of labor and property.

Should, however, the fears of the friends of order and virtue be realized, and scenes of fearful anarchy be again witnessed in France and in other parts of Europe, it would by no means follow that the French Revolution of 1793 had been, on the whole, a calamity to the world. In the midst of all this wild uproar, it may be true that the moral atmosphere is undergoing a purifying process, introductory to serener skies. It may still be true that every wise and thoughtful man would not hesitate to prefer the present age, with all its excitements and evils, to the iron despotism and unutterable crimes which marked the history of Europe up to the very close of the last century.

The preceding facts and arguments will, perhaps, be deemed conclusive, unless they are counterbalanced and neutralized by events of an opposite and deleterious character. The events and facts to which we have alluded are by eminence the leading occurrences and phenomena in civil history, and their effects have been, on the whole, permanent and salutary. Have these effects been annulled or vitiated by other destructive agencies?

What, then, have been these counteracting phenomena? The prevalence of Mohammedism, it may be replied. But this has never essentially affected Europe or Christendom. Asiatic or African history, we are not now considering.

The Roman Catholic religion, it may be affirmed, is another vast preponderating mischief. But this has been for three hundred years waning. When it lost its hold on the Germanic and Anglo-Saxon races, it in a sense, lost everything. The moral and intellectual power of Christendom is incontestably with the Protestant and northern nations. Its most efficient aids—the company of Jesus, are now exiles from almost all Christian lands. The freedom of the press, everywhere asserted, is one of the strongest supports and allies of Protestantism.

Again, modern rationalism, or existing forms of skepticism, may be adduced as powerful weights in the opposite scale. But the skepticism in question is comparatively limited in its influence. It does not affect in a very decided degree, the controlling civilization, the leading science and literature of Christendom. It has not penetrated into society so deeply, nor exerted such a malignant influence, as the infidelity that was rife in Scotland, England, France, and in the United States, near the latter part of the 18th century. Besides, this perverted learning, this haughty rationalism, is made to subserve the cause of truth. Its natural tendencies are restrained and counteracted. Its vast stores of learning and argument are compelled to promote the object which it seeks to destroy. The evidence for a supernatural revelation has been tested as it were by fire, with a thoroughness to which it was never before subjected, and it has come out of the ordeal triumphantly.

If the preceding argument be correct, then a miraculous intervention of the Almighty in the affairs of the world does not seem to be needed. The overthrow of the present system, does not call for the personal and visible intervention of the Messiah. The gospel, accompanied by supplies of supernatural grace, with the continued influence of a beneficent Providence, are adequate to the regeneration of society.

Again, a new interest is imparted to the page of history. It is not, as it often seems to be, a record of disconnected events, a medley of inconsistent and confused details, a labyrinth to which no clue can be found. It is not merely a scroll of mourning, lamentation and woe, revealing the punishments which God inflicts on sinning nations. One purpose, could we ascertain it, runs through the great volume. One key alone will unlock its mysteries. Were our eyes only illumined, like those of the ancient prophet, we should discover, not horses of fire or chariots of fire, but one vast, orderly, consistent plan, events great and small taking their appropriate places in the scheme; all tending to one final, auspicious consummation, for which the whole creation groaneth and travaileth together until now. The history of the world would be the history of redemption. The first qualification for what we call a secular historian would be faith in Christ, and faith in the coming redemption of mankind. History would be the last work in which an infidel or a mere scholar could engage. His insight would be of necessity feeble, his judgments shallow or incorrect. To do his work aright, he must assume as far as possible, the position of the Divine mind, or like the apocalyptic angel stand on the central, illuminating orb. He needs clearness of vision, a delicate discrimination, an enlightened moral sense and a hopeful frame of spirit more than learning, or judgment or any intellectual gift.

From this discussion the reasonableness of the foreign missionary enterprise is apparent. It is not an isolated work. It is not to be charged with enthusiasm or fanaticism. It is falling in with the great teachings of history and acting in accordance with the general course of nature and Providence. It is eminently a rational undertaking. It would hasten the developments of history and impart efficacy to powers otherwise inadequate. It would reäffirm and invigorate the voices of nature. It would demonstrate the perfect unity between the kingdoms of Providence and grace.

From the general course of Divine Providence the true philanthropist may derive great encouragement. He has no possible ground for despondency. His co-workers are God and his truth, the Holy Spirit, the Redeemer with his atoning death and interceding power, the verdict of his own reason, the testimony of conscience, his holiest sympathies and feelings; and not these alone,—

> ——"Thou hast other
> Powers that will work for thee, air, earth and skies.
> There's not a breathing of the common
> Wind that will forget thee! Thou hast great allies!
> Thy friends are exultations, agonies,
> And love and man's unconquerable mind."

Long ages past are on thy side, the present and the dim future. Thine are the revolutions of States and empires. Thy work in doing good is consentaneous with all changes from the birth of creation to its end. Willing or unwilling all agencies coöperate, not one is exempt. By invincible necessity or voluntary choice, all things shall work together, till those new heavens and that new earth appear wherein dwelleth righteousness.

——"From heaven the clouds shall roll,
The earth no longer be the vale of tears.
Speed on your swiftest wheels, ye golden spheres
To bring the splendors of that morning nigh.
Already the forgiven desert bears
The rose; the pagan lifts the adoring eye;
The exiled Hebrew seeks the day-break in the sky."

ARTICLE IX.

GREEK TRANSLATION OF PSALM CXXXVII.

[For the following translation of the 137th Psalm into Greek hexameters, we are indebted to Mr. Charles Short, of Roxbury. De Wette's version of the Psalm as found in "Die Heilige Schrift," edition of 1839, has been followed by the translator. This version is prefixed. A few Notes are subjoined.—E.]

1. An Babels Strömen, daſelbſt ſaßen wir, und weinten, indem wir Zions gedachten. 2. An den Weiden im Lande hängten wir unſre Harfen auf. 3. Daſelbſt forderten von uns unſre Sieger Geſang, und unſre Quäler Freudenlieder: „Singet uns Geſänge von Zion."

4. Wie ſollten wir ſingen Jehova's Geſang im Lande der Fremde? 5. Vergeſſ' ich dich, Jeruſalem, ſo vergeſſe [mich] meine Rechte! 6. Es klebe meine Zunge an meinem Gaumen, wenn ich dein nicht denke, wenn ich Jeruſalem nicht ſetze über die höchſten meiner Freuden!

7. Gedenke, Jehova, den Söhnen Edoms den Unglückstag Jeruſalems: die da riefen: „Reißt um, Reißt um bis auf ihre Grundveſte!" 8. Tochter Babels, du Verwüſterin! Heil dem, der deine Kinder ergreift und zerſchmettert an Felſen!

Ἥμεθ' ὅτ' ἄμμες ἐπὶ χθονὶ ἀμφὶ ῥοὰς ποταμοῖο,
δὴ τότε καὶ θαλερόν τε κατείβετο δάκρυ παρειῶν,
οὔτε τι τέρπομεν ἂρ θυμὸν φόρμιγγι λιγείῃ·
ἡμᾶς γὰρ κραδίην ποθὴ ἵκετο πατρίδος αἴης.
ἔνθ' οἳ νίκησάν τε κρείσσονες οἵ τ' ἐγένοντο,
τοὶ λέγον ἡμῖν πολλά τ' ὀνείδεα καὶ προσέειπον·
Λαιμόνιοι, ἔπε' ἄμμιν ἀείδετε ἱμερόεντα.
Πῶς δὴ ἡμεῖς τοῖσί γ' ἀείσομεν ἄλλοθι πάτρης;
εἰ δέ κεν ἐκλελάθωμαι ἐγὼ πόλιός τε φίλων τε,
ἦ εἰ ἐμοὶ γαίης γλυκερώτερον ἄλλο ἴδωμαι,
τῷ κεν ἀοιδὴν καὶ ἐμὲ θεσπεσίην τ' ἀφέληται
καὶ αἰὲν μάλα κεν Θεὸς ἐκλελάθῃ κιθαριστύν.
τίσειαν τοί, ὦ Πάτερ, ἄλγεα σοῖσι βέλεσσιν
ἡμέτερ', οἳ τότε μάκρ' ἐβόησαν φώνησάν τε·
Αἴθε τάχ' ἡμύσειε πόλις δεινοῖο θεοῖο
χερσὶν ὑφ' ὑμετέρῃσιν ἁλοῦσά τε περθομένη τε.
Ὦ πτολίπορθε, ποδὸς τεταγὼν σά γε νήπια τέκνα
ἦ ποτε ῥίψει τις δηΐων τοι λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον.

April, 1848. C. S.

Notes.

The 137th Psalm for tenderness and poetic beauty is hardly excelled by any composition in the entire collection. The reader is introduced at once into the midst of the sad scenes of the exile, and can almost look upon the neglected harp and hear the wailing lamentations. The Psalm was evidently composed subsequently to the return of the Jews from Babylon, yet not long after that event. It is not to be regarded simply as an expression of the feelings of which any captive Jew, endued with quick sensibilities, might be conscious, or as an outburst of patriotism; it is a record of pious emotion, of the fervent desires of the poor exiles that they might see the city of their solemnities again, and join in the worship which had once been paid to their fathers' God. They would rather be door-keepers in their national house of prayer than live amid all the sensual delights of Babylon.

The Psalm is naturally divided into three strophes. Vs. 1—3 express the sorrow of the exiles in their remembrance of Zion. It would be doing violence to their most sacred feelings to comply with the demand of their proud oppressors to sing to them the songs of Zion. Vs. 4—6 give utterance to the passionate determination of the

exiles never to profane the Lord's songs by singing them in a foreign land, and never to forget their beloved city. Vs. 7, 8 invoke destruction upon the Edomites for their cruel conduct at the time Jerusalem was destroyed, and also upon the Babylonians for their oppressive acts.

V. 1. נַהֲרוֹת. Euphrates, Tigris, Chaboras, etc., and the canals which intersected the country. The exiles would naturally resort to the banks of the streams as shady, cool and retired spots, where they could indulge in their sorrowful remembrances. The prophets of the exile saw their visions by the rivers, Ez. 1: 1. Dan. 8: 2. 10: 4.

V. 2. עֲרָבִים *weeping willow*, the salix Babylonica of Linn., with pendulous leaves, which grows on the banks of streams. The suffix in בְּתוֹכָהּ refers to Babel. The כִּנּוֹר was an instrument much used in joyful festivals, Gen. 31: 27. 1 Sam. 10: 5. 2 Sam. 6: 5; the ceasing to play upon it denoted a great and public grief or calamity, Is. 5: 12. Ez. 26: 13. Apoc. 18: 22. Job 30: 31. כִּי "we have let our harps rest, *for* our oppressers," etc.

V. 3. מִשִּׁיר one or some of the songs, comp. Ps. 132: 11.

V. 5. Had the captives complied with this demand in a strange country, among the heathen, they would have desecrated their sacred hymns, and as it were denied their native land. "Then let my right hand forget," i. e. her musical skill.

V. 6. "Let my tongue also refuse its office." *Chief joy*, lit. head of my joy. Comp. Cant. 4: 14 רֹאשׁ בְּשָׂמִים *chief perfume or fragrance.*

V. 7. In regard to the cruel and faithless conduct of the Edomites at the destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans, see the Prophecy of Obadiah. Lam. 4: 21, 22. Jer. 49: 7—22. Ez. 25: 12—15. The Edomites being related to the Hebrews, had been spared by God's command, when the Hebrews invaded Canaan. Yet they stood by at the siege of Jerusalem and stimulated the Chaldeans in their work of destruction and death. "Neither shouldst thou have stood in the cross-way to cut off those of his that escaped." "The cup also shall pass through unto thee, thou shalt be drunken." עָרֵה Imp. Piel. בָּהּ *in Jerusalem*, a periphrasis for the Genitive.

V. 8. הַשְּׁדוּדָה has been explained in a variety of ways. Seventy: ἡ ταλαίπωρος; Vulg. *misera;* others, *destroyer, powerful, violent*, or *fierce.* Perhaps it best suits the context to regard it as expressing what is already accomplished; it is so certain, in the view of the psalmist, that the ruin will come, that he uses the past Part. as if the work were now completed. "O daughter of Babylon, the destroyed!"

The imprecations in this Psalm, as Hengstenberg remarks, are only an individualizing of the declaration of our Lord, "With what measure ye meet, it shall be measured to you again." The destruction

of the children of the Babylonians is a just recompense for their cruelties towards the Jews. He, who finds fault with the spirit of these verses, and denounces it as a relic of a barbarous age, has very inadequate or erroneous views both of the principles of the Divine government, and of the deeper necessities of his own moral nature. When outrageous cruelty or wickedness of any kind, meets with retribution, we feel that it is condign, just, deserved, and this feeling is consistent with the tenderest compassion. Milton's lines find a response in the breast of every right minded reader:

> Avenge, O Lord, thy slaughtered saints, whose bones
> Lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold;
> Even them who kept thy truth so pure of old,
> When all our fathers worshipped stocks and stones,
> Forget not.

ARTICLE X.

MISCELLANIES AND CORRESPONDENCE.

MUNICH—THE CITY AND UNIVERSITY.

IT is a matter of the deepest regret that in the establishment or enlargement of our cities, in the founding of our public buildings, colleges, etc., there have not been some controlling minds possessed of cultivated taste and enlarged views, that would have given a form and direction to architecture, uniting at the same time economy and convenience with the highest principles of art. In the first place, a suitable locality should be chosen, so that the general effect of an edifice would be most impressive. Then the material—stone if possible—should be selected, whose color, durability, massiveness, etc., would conform, as nearly as possible, to the object of an institution. Then that plan should be adopted, which would admit ultimately, if means are at first wanting, of those chaste and sublime ornaments, which are in fact, not mere ornaments, but become teachers of the young, the guides of taste, and ultimately useful in the highest degree, because their influence, though unseen, is ever active, ever insinuating, ever moulding the plastic souls of the youthful beholder, after their own ideal of beauty. But how sadly have all these things been neglected in our country. Our colleges, that profess to teach the principles of rhetoric and taste, must teach by negatives and contrast, must

point for illustrations to what these establishments are not, and to what they easily might have been. The student must be directed to nature, not to the works of man for his models. Man puts up piles of uncouth brick, standing in long, solemn rows, or huddled together in most unartistic confusion. No master genius was consulted; no enlightened plan was thought of, or at least carried out. The only aim was to put up a mass of bricks and mortar, or of pine boards and shingles, in the shortest possible time. Pure taste, high art, durability, real utility, were not brought into the account. The result is that these buildings become to all men of true cultivation distasteful objects; and it will be well if they are able to retain their affection for the institutions themselves, associated, as their outward forms are, with flagrant violations of taste and propriety.

The city of Munich, the capital of Bavaria, shows what can be accomplished by one great genius, by one eminent architect, who was not controlled by building committees, or by a mean economy. The city lies on a level and very unpicturesque plain, watered by the Iser, a sluggish branch of the Danube, which Campbell has immortalized in his poem. It is a modern city, and has none of those antique associations which cluster around Augsburgh, Nuremberg, and many other towns. It had a very unpoetic origin. It was erected on some salt works, owned by the monks, *Mönchen*, whence its name. But it has had one very distinguished architect, Von Klenze, under whose auspices, a great number of churches, museums, and other public edifices have been built. No sooner was the plan of a new building decided on, than work was provided for the painter and sculptor, in furnishing decorations for the interior and exterior. The arts of painting in fresco, in encaustic and on glass, once believed to have been lost, have been revived and carried to great perfection. There have been at one time not less than from six to eight hundred artists resident in the city, either attracted from other countries, or born and educated on the spot. To king Louis, whose fortunes are now so fallen, and whose moral principles have been shown within two or three years to be so sadly deficient, a great debt of gratitude is due for his enlarged patronage of the arts. His taste, seconded in so enlightened a manner, by Von Klenze, Schwanthaler, Cornelius, Ohlmüller and others, has made Munich one of the most interesting cities in Europe. The king has created a taste which has spread over all parts of Germany. It should be recollected, too, that he has had at his command the resources of only a second-rate State, and that he has been sparing in availing himself of them, since the expense of the palace, the gallery of sculpture, and many of the most valuable specimens of art in that gallery and also in the gallery of paintings, were defrayed from his own private purse.

The parish church of Maria Hilf, in the suburb Au, beyond the Iser, is

one of the most beautiful ecclesiastical edifices of modern times. It was built by Ohlmüller, and is in the pointed Gothic style, with high lancet windows. There are nineteen large windows of modern painted glass, containing subjects from the Bible, designed by living painters, and executed under the direction of Hess in the China manufactory at Munich.

The new palace, facing the Max Joseph's square, is an imitation of the ornaments of the Loggie of the Vatican at Rome, or of a more ancient model, the houses at Pompeii. The walls of the State apartments are painted with subjects from the great German epic, the Niebelungenlied. They are the productions of Professor Schnorr, and are considered to be very fine specimens of historical painting. The ceilings and walls of the king's apartments are decorated with encaustic paintings illustrating the Greek poets; those of her majesty contain subjects from the principal German poets. The paintings in the throne-room are surrounded by beautiful Arabesque or Romanesque borders, either original or copied from Pompeii. There is perhaps no palace in Europe (the English would except Windsor castle), which in splendor, comfort and good taste, can vie with that of the king of Bavaria.

The Pinacothek, or Picture gallery, has just been completed from the designs of Von Klenze. It is a beautiful edifice, and the most convenient receptacle for paintings in Europe. On the façade is a row of twenty-five statues of the greatest painters, modelled by Schwanthaler. The number of paintings is limited to about 1500, consisting of a selection of the best works out of all the collections belonging to the king, including the galleries of Düsseldorf, Mannheim, and many others, which amount to 7000 single works. They are arranged according to schools in seven splendid halls and twenty-three adjoining small cabinets. The large pictures of each division, or school, are placed in the central halls, and are lighted from above. The apartments, devoted to the German school, include the *élite* of the Boisserée gallery, commenced at Cologne, in 1804, by two brothers of that name, and for which the king paid 375,000 florins. The longest hall of the gallery and one cabinet are exclusively occupied by ninety-five works of Rubens. The Fall of the Damned or the Fallen Angels, Sir Joshua Reynolds pronounced to be one of the greatest efforts of genius that the art has produced.

The Glyptothek, gallery of sculpture, is a classical edifice of the Ionic order. A separate apartment is devoted to the works of each distinct department of art, and the decorations of every apartment are adapted to its contents. The hall of modern sculpture contains Canova's Venus and Paris, Thorwaldsen's Adonis and Schadow's Girl fastening her Sandal.

The moral impression of many of the productions, especially of those in the gallery of paintings, is beneficial in the highest degree. Some of

the most touching and awful scenes of time and of eternity, are so portrayed as to impress the conscience, and haunt the memory, and linger in the imagination for days and weeks. In Rubens, what a prodigious fertility of invention, what daring confidence of genius in selecting his subjects, what coloring and what truth to nature! How perfectly life-like some of his portraits! One's respect and love for the German masters, too, are constantly augmenting—for Albert Dürer, old Lewis Cranach, so associated with the reformers, and for the brilliant coloring of Wohlgemuth.

The famous telescope establishment of Frauenhofer, is in Müller Street, outside of the gates. The business is carried on in a large house of four stories. It contains no external sign of the work that is performed within. Frauenhofer himself died June 7, 1826, probably in consequence of his unremitted labors. His grave is near that of his friend and partner, Von Reichenbach. On his tomb is the epitaph, *approximavit sidera.* The firm is maintained with undiminished reputation by Utschneider. Forty men are now employed in the establishment. The directors exhibited much complacency in showing the magnificent telescope belonging to Harvard College, which was completed near the close of 1847, and which cost about 42,000 florins. The smallest telescope which is made here is worth about ten dollars.

Lithography was invented in Munich by Aloys Sennefelder about the year 1800, and the art still maintains great perfection here. In 1826, Sennefelder invented a new process for taking impressions on colored sheets, so as to imitate oil painting. This art he called mosaic painting. He died Feb. 26, 1834.

The most imposing street in Munich is the Ludwig's strasse, built under the auspices of king Louis, terminated at one end by a lofty triumphal arch. On both sides of the street, near the arch, is the university of Munich. At a little distance on the same street is the building which contains the public library and the archives. It was begun in 1832 and finished in 1843. It is a noble structure, of ample dimensions, and surpasses any other building in the world, which is devoted to this purpose. The entrance is from Ludwig's strasse, by some stately steps, on the parapet of which are four statues, in a sitting posture, eight feet high—Aristotle, Thucydides, Hippocrates and Homer, indicating the design of the building. The printed books are arranged into twelve main classes, viz. Encyclopedias with 11 subdivisions; Philology with 18; History with 40; Mathematics with 8; Physics with 13; Anthropology with 4; Philosophy with 3; Aesthetics with 15; Politics with 6; Medicine with 8; Jurisprudence with 16; Theology with 38; total, 180 subdivisions. To show the nature of the subdivision, we may select the class of history

which includes universal geography, maps, collected journals of travels, single books of travels, chronology, genealogy, heraldry, antiquities, archaeology, ancient coins, recent coins, universal history, annals, political ephemerides, ancient history, intercalary history, history of Europe, various countries of Europe under a number of heads, extra European history, history and geography of other portions of the world, Jews, biographical collections, single biographies, miscellaneous history. There are besides these, twelve special collections, embracing such objects as dissertations, incunabula (books printed before 1501), books printed on parchment, Chinese books, editions of the Dance of Death, etc. In each department the books are arranged according to the three principal forms, folio, quarto and octavo. Alphabetical catalogues and catalogues by subjects are in the process of preparation. Two or three thousand printed volumes are added to the library yearly, 16,000 florins being annually devoted to that object by the government. One copy of every book published in the kingdom is required to be sent to the library.

The Mss., exceeding 22,000, are arranged according to languages. The number in the German exceeds 4000, French between 500 and 600, Italian between 400 and 500, 242 picture Mss., 587 musical, 700 catalogues, etc.

Among the more valuable or curious objects in the library are the following: An Arabic Koran in golden letters, which belonged to a confessor of Louis XIV.; a Koran remarkable for its extreme diminutiveness; a breviary of Alaric the Visigoth; A Ms., half uncial, without any separation of the words, of the 6th or 7th century; parts of the four Gospels, half uncial, of the ante-Jerome translation; the orations of Demosthenes on cotton paper from Chios; a collection of traditions of a church of Ravenna on papyrus of the 9th century; a translation of the Gospels into Latin of the 5th century; New Testament, written in gold and silver letters on purple vellum of the 9th century; Albert Dürer's Prayer Book, with very interesting sketches by him and Cranach, etc. The library contains about 10,000 books printed before 1500, including 50 block books, some of them printed at Harlem. One of the oldest specimens of printing, 1454, contains an appeal to arms against the Turks. There are also the first Latin Bibles printed at Mayence between 1450 and 1455, by Gutemberg and Faust, and the oldest works, having a date, which were printed at Augsburgh, Nuremberg and Munich.

The number of printed works, without regard to the volumes, amounts to 400,000. We are happy to add that the utmost courtesy is shown to strangers, who visit this library, the second in the world in its size, and altogether the first in regard to its arrangement, and in the splendor and commodiousness of the edifice which contains it Philip Von Lichten-

thaler is the chief librarian, and J. A. Schmeller, assistant, with nineteen subordinate officers.

The university of Munich is the principal school of learning in the Bavarian dominions, being frequented by about 1400 students. It was originally founded at Ingolstadt, 1472; thence transferred to Landshut, 1800; and finally removed to Munich, 1826. Thiersch, a man of liberal views, is now rector. Among the eminent professors are Neumann, the Chinese scholar, Massmann, Schubert, the oriental traveller, Görres, Höfler, Sternberg, Schmeller, etc. To the five faculties of the university, there has lately been added a high-school for the practical arts.

Bibliothèque Royale, now National Library at Paris.

The long, inelegant building, No. 58, Rue Vivienne, in front of the Place Richelieu, Paris, contains the largest library in the world. The meanness of the building and the disposition of the books form a very marked contrast with the fine edifice and the scientific arrangements of the library at Munich. The length of the building is 540 feet, the breadth 130. Up to the time of St. Louis, the few books in France, mostly copies of the Bible, fathers, canons and missals, belonged to the numerous convents. St. Louis caused copies of all these Mss. to be made, and arranged in a room belonging to the Sainte Chapelle. This was bequeathed to several monasteries. King John's library did not exceed eight or ten volumes. Charles V. formed a library of 910 volumes, which was deposited in a tower of the Louvre. These books were illuminated missals, legends of the saints, works on astrology, etc. This collection was partly dispersed under Charles VI, and the remainder were carried to England, having been purchased for 1200 livres by the duke of Bedford. Most of these were subsequently brought back by the princes John and Charles d'Angoulême. In 1496, Louis XII. transported the library of the Louvre, with several other collections, to Blois. Francis I. carried the whole to Fontainebleau, consisting of 1890 volumes. It was removed to Paris by Henry IV. in 1594. It was greatly enriched by Louis XIII, and numbered 16,746 volumes. Under Louis XIV. the treasures of the library were immensely augmented. At his death in 1715, it exceeded 70,000 volumes. In 1721, it was removed to the building, where it has ever since remained, which had been previously the Hôtel de Nevers, and a part of the immense palace of Cardinal Mazarin. The other part of this palace was annexed to it in 1829, when the treasury was removed to the rue de Rivoli. At the death of Louis XV. the library exceeded 100,000 volumes. At the suppression of the monasteries at the revolution, all the Mss. and printed volumes belonging to them, were added to

the library. Bonaparte enriched it with spoils from the greater part of Europe, most of which were restored in 1815. An annual grant has been made for many years by the government for the purchase of books, Mss., engravings, etc. In 1846, the sum granted to this library and to three others, was 555,823 francs.

The library is divided into five distinct sections; 1. The printed works. 2. Mss., genealogies, etc. 3. Medals, antique gems, etc. 4. Engravings. 5. The zodiac and antique marbles. The second room on the first floor contains a series of specimens of ancient ornamental book-binding. In the third room are specimens of printing from the time of Gutemberg to the present. In the transverse gallery are two models in porcelain of the celebrated porcelain towers of China, given to Louis XIV. Next is the public reading gallery, which is generally crowded. The average daily number of readers is stated to be nearly 400. The works are kept in wired book-cases. On the ground floor are modern folio editions, on vellum, etc., or copies remarkable for the richness of their binding. One of the greatest curiosities in the library, "is the most ancient printed book *with a date*;" it is a Psalter, printed in Mayence, in 1457, by Faust and Schaeffer. The Mazarin Bible, also in this library, was printed in 1456, with cut metal types.

The number of medals and coins is computed at 100,000. Many are exceedingly rare, and some are unique. The series of Roman coins is quite remarkable. Twenty Etruscan vases, found at Caere in Etruria, eight suits of complete armor, with many antique curiosities, will attract the visitor.

The Mss. are arranged in galleries on the first and second floors. They consist of about 80,000 volumes, in French, Latin, Greek, oriental and other languages, including 30,000 which relate to the history of France. The catalogues fill twenty-four volumes, besides ample supplements to each. In a gallery, which existed in the time of Mazarin, 140 feet in length and 22 in breadth, many precious and rare Mss. are preserved. Among them is a very interesting historic record of A. D. 781, in Chinese and Syriac, found in Canton in 1628, giving an account of the arrival of the Syrian missionaries in China, and of the propagation of Christianity in that country, in the 7th and 8th centuries. There are also the Ms. of Telemachus in Fenelon's own hand; the Mss. of Galileo; Missals of the 5th and 6th centuries; Coptic, Persian, Arabic, and Ethiopian Mss., etc.

The number of plates of engravings amounts to 1,400,000, contained in upwards of 9000 volumes or portfolios. The portraits, to the number of 60,000, are divided in each country, according to the rank or profession of the individual, and are classed in chronological or alphabetical order. The series of costumes of various ages and countries is very in-

teresting. The history of France will form 150 volumes. The topographical collection contains about 300,000 maps, charts, etc. A room on the ground floor contains the Egyptian Zodiac of Denderah, supposed to have formed the centre of the ceiling of a temple. There are also Bactrian inscriptions, discovered near the Indus. In the court yard are some bas-reliefs from Karnac, nearly 4000 years old.

Paris possesses five public libraries, to which admission is absolutely free, not including those of the institute, the university and those which belonged to the two late Chambers. These five libraries contain, according to a statement in the British Review, August, 1847, at least 1,300,000 volumes of printed books, viz.

1.	National	Library,	800,000 volumes.
2.	Arsenal	"	180,000 "
3.	St. Genevieve	"	165,000 "
4.	Mazarin	"	100,000 "
5.	Town	"	55,000 "
		Total,	1,300,000

The above, it should be remarked, is a low estimate; the Paris authorities make the number in the national library much larger.

What effects the recent revolution in France may have upon the national library, upon the learned societies, and upon the general cause of science and literature, cannot now be foreseen. Disastrous results may be anticipated at least for a time, owing to the universal derangement of business, the cessation from labor, etc. A popular government, if one should be firmly established, will, doubtless, be found very reluctant to bestow its money for the advancement of the arts and the higher branches of science and literature. If the existing noble treasures, which Paris possesses, can be preserved uninjured, we shall have great reason to rejoice. The Parisian population have, not unfrequently, exhibited a respect for property, which we should hardly have anticipated. The royal library was left untouched and unharmed, through the first Revolution.

Literary and Theological Institutions in Edinburgh.

It was a remark of the poet Wordsworth, that in his view, the two most interesting cities in Europe, are Edinburgh and Venice. Edinburgh, for advantages of position, for the number of noble views which are afforded by various localities within the city and around it, is probably unrivalled. Viewed from Princes Street, from Calton Hill, from Arthur's Seat, from the castle, and several other points, the panorama is extremely picturesque and impressive. It combines nearly all the ele-

ments fitted to excite the imagination,—quaint, lofty, antique buildings, bold and craggy precipices almost in the heart of the city, the sea at a little distance, some fine specimens of modern architecture, the green fields on the south and west, the Castle and the Holyrood palace, and many objects, which have been consecrated in the history of Scotland or by the genius of Sir Walter Scott.

Edinburgh is divided by a deep ravine, the old town being on the south side, the new on the north. Through the old town from east to west, runs a straight and wide street, near the ravine and parallel to it, the lower part, called Canongate, terminating at Holyrood palace; the upper, High Street, ending at the castle. This street is crossed at right angles, about the centre of the old city, by another wide street, called South and North Bridge Street, which also spans the ravine by a stately bridge, and connects the two parts of Edinburgh. On the western side of South Bridge Street, in the old town, the University of Edinburgh is situated. The foundations of the present building were laid in 1789. They are of a quadrangular form, the sides measuring 358 by 255 feet, with a spacious court in the centre. The eastern front is adorned with a portico, supported by Doric columns, 20 feet in height, each composed of a single block of stone. The course of instruction in this university was commenced in 1583, the institution being founded the year previously by James VI. There are thirty-four charitable foundations, whose benefit is extended to eighty students. The aggregate amount is only £1172 per annum. The collections in natural history are large. The library occupies the south side of the building. The principal apartment is admirably adapted to its purposes. No test of any description is required from the students. They are not resident within the college, nor are they distinguished by any peculiarity of dress. They have perfect freedom in selecting the classes which they attend. Those students, however, who apply for a degree in medicine and the arts, must take a prescribed course; in the latter case, the student is required to attend the classes of Latin, Greek, Logic, Rhetoric, Moral Philosophy, Natural Philosophy and Mathematics. The number of students attending the university is from 1000 to 1200. At the beginning of the present century, the university was adorned with the illustrious names of Robertson, Playfair, Dugald Stewart, Cullen, Monro, Gregory, Blair, Black and Robison. Among the teachers at the present time are Sir William Hamilton, Prof. of Logic and Metaphysics, Wilson, of Moral Philosophy and Political Economy, Pillans of Latin, Jameson of Natural History, Dunbar of Greek, etc. As a school of medicine, it has always held a very distinguished place. When the chair of divinity was occupied by Dr. Chalmers, that department was very flourishing.

The Advocates' Library, which is a few rods north-west of the university, adjoining the Parliament House, contains the most valuable collection of books in Scotland, the printed works amounting to 150,000 volumes, and the Mss. to 1700. The collection of Scottish poetry is very rich and curious. This is one of the five libraries which receive a copy of every new work published in Great Britain and Ireland. The library is managed with the greatest liberality and courtesy. Strangers are freely admitted without introduction. The members are entitled to draw twenty-five volumes at one time, and to lend any of the books so borrowed to their friends. The office of librarian has been held, among others, by Thomas Ruddiman, David Hume and Adam Ferguson. David Irving, LL. D., an accomplished scholar, is now librarian.

A part of the ravine, separating the old from the new town, has been filled up. On an elevation thus formed, near Sir Walter Scott's monument, the buildings for the new college of the Free Presbyterian church are to be erected. The professors in this college are Rev. Drs. Cunningham, Black, Duncan, Buchanan, and Rev. Mr. Fraser. It is not yet determined, we believe, whether to confine the course of study to theology and the related sciences, or to extend it over the general field of science and literature.

On the southern slope of the Calton hill, on which are the observatory, the twelve columns the beginning of what was intended to be an exact reproduction of the Parthenon, the graceful monument to Dugald Stewart, etc., stands the High School of Edinburgh. It overlooks the buildings of the old town. The edifice is modern and spacious, has a most commanding site, and is not deficient in architectural beauty. The school, embracing both Classical and English studies, has long been one of the most distinguished in Great Britain. The studies are conducted by a rector (now Dr. Leonhard Schmitz), four classical masters, a French and German teacher, a teacher of writing, and a teacher of arithmetic and mathematics. Of these, the first five have a small endowment from the city, in addition to the class-fees. From the rector's class, many of the students proceed to the universities. The classical books studied in that class are parts of the following, viz. Tibullus, Virgil, Horace's Odes, Livy, Tacitus, Juvenal, Xenophon, Anabasis, one play of Sophocles and Plato's Apology. Among the text-books are Adam's Antiquities, Dunbar's Greek Grammar, Mair's Introduction, Schmitz's History of Rome, Porteous's Evidences of Christianity, etc. Particular attention appears to be given to religious instruction from the Scriptures. The principle of emulation is brought into very active exercise by means of a large number of prizes, by the publication of the names of successful competitors, etc. Of course, the instances are not rare of very severe study, and of distinguished at-

tainment. The school appeared to the writer of these lines to be conducted on an admirable system, combining a wise arrangement of studies, unity under one head with the individual responsibility of all the masters, and ensuring a scholarship which has long been the boast of the school and of the city.

BRITISH MUSEUM.

This great establishment, most honorable to the British nation and government, is not far from the centre of London, in Bloomsbury, a little north of Oxford Street, one of the great arteries of the city. It has Great Russell Street on the south, Charlotte Street and Bedford Square on the west, Montague Place on the north, and Montague Street on the east. It is admirably situated for safety, and for convenience of resort from all parts of London. It includes a library of manuscripts, a library of printed books, a museum of ancient sculpture, museums of natural history in all its departments, collections of prints, of medals, and of maps and charts, and the nucleus of an ethnographical museum. The buildings cover so large an area, and a part of them when seen by the writer, were in so incomplete a condition, that it is difficult to state what will be the architectural effect of the whole. The same great fault will probably exist as is seen in most of the palaces and public buildings of London—want of proportionate height. Many of these edifices look tame and contemptible by being extended over a large area without any corresponding elevation. Most of the buildings which surround Waterloo Place are a failure, partly from this cause.

The whole sum devoted to the British Museum by Parliament, including the current year, 1847–8, amounts to £2,061,895, or $10,309,475. The real estate (Montague House, etc.) and the new buildings have cost about one half of this sum. Sir Hans Sloane's collections, a collection of Mss. by the first two earls of Oxford, the Cottonian collection of Mss., with a small library by Arthur Edwards, when brought together, became the British Museum. Sir H. Sloane was the real founder. The number of printed books, when first opened to the public in 1757, did not probably exceed 40,000. In 1759, George II. gave a library of 9000 volumes, which was begun by Henry VII. Dr. Thomas Birch, Arthur Onslow and Sir Joseph Banks were, successively, contributors. In 1799, Rev. C. M. Cracherode, bequeathed 4500 volumes, including many *incunabula* and rare editions. In 1813, Parliament purchased the fine law library of Francis Hargrave, and in 1818, Dr. Burney's library, rich in Greek classics. In 1823, George IV. presented to the Museum the splendid library, collected by his father, comprising more than 65,000 well selected volumes,

which had cost upwards of £300,000. With their rich bindings, and placed in a truly magnificent hall, they form one of the chief attractions of the Museum. This collection is very valuable in classics, in English history, in Italian, French and Spanish literature. The last great addition was made in 1847,—the library of Rt. Hon. Thos. Grenville, amounting to more than 20,000 volumes, and said to contain a greater number of select, rare and costly works, than any private library in Great Britain, except Lord Spencer's. It has a copy of the Mazarin Bible, Faust and Schaeffer's Bible of 1462, Mentelin's Bible of 1470, the Complutensian Polyglott, the first English Bible, the first English Psalter, the first edition of Cranmer's Great Bible, Tyndale's Pentateuch of 1530. The Grenville copy of the *editio princeps* of the Latin Vulgate, printed about 1450 at Mayence, is one of five copies known to exist on vellum. Only four copies of the first edition of Cranmer's Bible are known to exist. The Latin Psalter of 1457 is a master piece of typography. The Museum had offered previously £600 for a copy belonging to the Würtemberg library, the curators of which demanded £2000.

The Museum has a noble collection of pamphlets, 130,000 in number, including the collections of George Thomason, who lived in the time of the Commonwealth; a French collection of 40,000, published during the first revolution, mostly in Paris; 19,000 which belonged to the library of George III., etc.

Among the recent additions are a selection of Bibles from the fine collection of the Duke of Sussex; 12,000 Chinese volumes belonging to the late Mr. J. R. Morrison; 2500 additional volumes of Chinese works; a few valuable oriental works from the library of De Sacy; a curious collection on South America; a large part of the stock of the eminent antiquarian bookseller, Kuppitsch of Vienna, very rich in early German literature, with 360 works under the head 'Luther,' etc. The Museum have ordered the purchase of all American works which have been printed in the United States. The number added to the library during 1846, was nearly 45,000, of which 20,000 were by the Grenville bequest, and 3000 by the copy-right act. The whole number of *volumes* in the British Museum may now be stated at 350,000, and of works as exceeding 550,000.[1]

[1] For a part of the preceding statements in regard to the British Museum, we are indebted to a very extended and admirable article, published in August, 1847, in Dr. Vaughan's British Quarterly Review, and prepared, as we learn privately, by a gentleman every way competent, who is connected with the Museum.

The following extract is translated from a letter written by Dr. Bernstein, Professor of Oriental Literature at Breslau, to Dr. Davies of Montreal, who has kindly sent it to us:

"I purpose to publish a complete Syriac-Latin Lexicon. For this end I have been collecting materials for more than twenty-five years. The work is to embrace, as far as possible, all the stores of the Syriac language now open to us; and I have brought together two folio and two quarto volumes of such materials from the perusal of Syriac authors. The very extent of this collection increases the labor of preparation; for the careful investigation of passages in treating each word demands much time and toil. I am, therefore, not yet able to say with certainty when the Lexicon will be printed. The plan of the work is the same as that which I have followed in the Lexicon to the Syriac Chrestomathy of Kirsch, which I intended should serve as a specimen; i. e. the meanings of the words are to be philosophically developed, and to be illustrated and established by examples or proof passages. For this purpose I have sought to obtain also the Syriac-Arabic Lexicon of Bar-Bahhul, which was absolutely necessary; and I have selected, as the best copy, the Ms. Hunt. 157, belonging to the Bodleian Library, in which the Arabic is not written with Syriac, but with Arabic letters. The Bodleian possesses another copy of this work, in which the Arabic is written with Syriac letters, and which agrees almost perfectly with the Cambridge copy (both being transcripts of one and the same Ms.); but these are of less value than the first mentioned. Of the second I have copied only the half, which I have collated with the Cambridge Ms. It was this second Bodleian Ms. that Castell used for his Syriac Lexicon, but only superficially, for he has not adopted or rightly produced the half of it. He often misread the Arabic as written in Syriac characters, and there were already errors in the Ms.; hence he has given many false meanings. My plan was first to get Bar-Bahhul printed, in order to be able to refer to it afterwards in my Lexicon. The Prussian Government has not, however, guaranteed the 2,500 thaler to cover the expense of printing; and so I have been compelled to abandon this thought.

I have, in compliance with the request of many, resolved to prepare a new edition and a Latin translation of the Syriac Chronicle of Bar-Hebræus. This is wanted, for the edition of Bruns and Kirsch is very faulty. The Vatican possesses a splendid Ms. of this work, from which a very excellent text is obtained. The edition is to be brought out by subscription, and will be printed only when sufficient encouragement appears. The German Oriental Society has given from its present small resources a considerable sum towards the cost of publishing it. Dr. Frähn

of Petersburgh, who first set the matter on foot, has promised many subscribers from Russia; and it is hoped there will be some in England and America.

Professor Tullberg, of Upsala, is about to edit, with a Latin translation, the second part of this Chronicle; which embraces Ecclesiastical History, and which has not yet been printed, except in part by J. S. Assemani, who has given copious extracts from it in his Bibliotheca Orientalis. The text is obtained from various Mss. in the British Museum, at Florence and in Rome. Professor T. is also preparing for the press, from copies in the British Museum and the Vatican, the Book of Paradise, written by Palladius and Hieronymus, which is so celebrated among the Syrians.

As to the preparation of a Syriac Grammar, I cannot under existing circumstances entertain the thought. The Grammar of Uhlemann, borrowed from Hoffmann's Thesaurus, is the most serviceable now extant, on account of its compactness. I use it in my classes. Both of these Grammars are, however, unphilosophical, and abounding in mistakes."

Plato's Parmenides by Stallbaum, with Prolegomena, commentary, etc. —a work which has been received with the highest approbation, has appeared; also the 2nd edition, in two volumes, of Sallust by Prof. Kritz of Erfurt. Becker's Manual of Roman Antiquities will be continued by Prof. Marquardt of Dantzig, author of a work on the Equites Romani. The second volume of the works of Tacitus, under the care of L. Döderlein, containing the History, Germania, Agricola, and the Dialogue De Oratoribus, has been published.

The 7th volume of the Exegetical Manual to the Old Testament (Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch) contains the Proverbs of Solomon by Prof. Bertheau of Göttingen, and Ecclesiastes by Prof. Hitzig of Zurich. Various introductory matters in relation to Proverbs are elaborately discussed in about fifty pages. The commentary is brought into 112. One hundred and ten pages are devoted to Ecclesiastes, only thirteen of which are employed in preliminary observations. The 8th volume of the Manual by Hitzig, in 400 pages, is devoted to Ezekiel. The page is large and the matter exceedingly condensed. The author seems to have devoted his best powers to this exposition, and it will doubtless take a high place among the very few satisfactory works upon this difficult prophet. The eight volumes of the Manual, which comprehend the books of Judges and Ruth, the two books of Samuel, the book of Job, and all the books in the Old Testament after the Psalms, with the exception of the Canticles and Lamentations, can be purchased for about eight dollars.

The commentary on Job—being the continuation of Maurer—forms the

first section of the fourth volume of the work, and is embraced in 288 pages. The author is A. Heiligstedt, a young Leipsic scholar. It seems that Maurer was prevented by private engagements from completing his plan. His principles are adopted by the continuator. The difficult forms of the language are explained, and there are frequent references to Ewald's Grammar of 1844, and to Rödiger's Gesenius, 1845. The introductory matters are briefly discussed in thirty-four pages. The author's general views of the book are thus summed up: Job, distinguished for his prosperity and piety, lived, in the patriarchal times in the land of Uz, was afflicted by the elephantiasis, patiently bore this calamity, and was at length relieved and restored to his former state. The names of his three friends are not fictitious, but were handed down in oral narratives. The prologue, epilogue, etc. are poetic decorations. The book seems to have been written after the ten tribes had been carried captive, about 700 B. C., and by a native Hebrew. The famous passage, 19: 23—29, the author explains of God, who would appear on earth, in Job's life-time, to vindicate his afflicted and calumniated servant.

The last part of Hengstenberg's Commentary on the Psalms was published in 1847. One hundred and ninety-five pages are occupied with the exposition of Pss. 120—150, and the remaining 130 pages with dissertations, 1. On the names, contents and divisions of the Psalms; 2. On the history of Psalmody; 3. On the authors of the Psalms; 4. On the inscriptions; 5. On the formal arrangement of the Psalms; 6. On the origin of the present collection of Psalms, their division into five books, etc.; and 7. On the religious doctrines of the Psalms. These poems, according to Hengstenberg, fall into three main divisions, *first*, those which express joyful confidence in God, thankfulness for his gifts to individuals and the nation, the inward experience of his love, etc.; *second*, those which express sad thoughts, complaints, variations of the *Kyrie eleeson;* and *third*, the didactic Psalms, conveying moral instruction. Moses is named as the author of Ps. 90; David is the author of eighty Psalms, viz. 1—41, 51—71, 101—3, 108—110, 122, 124, 131, 133, 138—145; Asaph of twelve Psalms; the Sons of Korah of Pss. 42—49 and of 84—89; Solomon of Pss. 72, 127; the authors of the others are not named. The inscriptions, according to Hengstenberg, are a part of the original text, and are in all cases to be received. In the exposition, he has sought to show that the contents of a Psalm in no case are in opposition to the title. The rejection of these titles, he attributes to the efforts of rationalist critics. "The collection of the Psalms could not have been completed before the dedication of the city walls under Nehemiah, to which the last Psalms refer. It could not have been later, partly because of the history of the canon, which was concluded in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, and partly on ac-

count of the character of Ps. 150, which has manifestly the aim of forming a full-toned conclusion to the whole." "The Psalms are full of the noblest testimonies to the being and attributes of God. They have in this respect contributed immensely to develop human knowledge; and the faith of the Christian church rests on them far more than might at first view be obvious." "The mystery of the Trinity, is not clearly brought out in the Psalms." "Still, we find in this case, as in regard to other doctrines, which are first fully unfolded in the New Testament, the germs of what was later developed." The author takes up and discusses briefly the doctrines of angels good and evil, of sin, its origin, punishment, etc., legal sacrifices, justification, sanctification, the Messianic predictions (the Messianic Psalms being in part directly so, and in part typical), immortality of the soul, divine retribution, etc.

The commentary of Hengstenberg would have been more valuable, if it had been condensed into two volumes of 500 pages each. It is extended to five volumes, embracing in all 2165 pages. This unconscionable length will seriously interfere with the usefulness of the work, both in the original and in the English translation. Many of the quotations might have been dispensed with, and some of the discussions are needlessly protracted. Still, the production will be welcomed by all Christian students of the Psalter. The author is not a heartless and scoffing rationalist. He has a warm sympathy with the spirit of the Psalms and with the doctrines of the cross, and is not afraid to avow his convictions. He has brought the rich stores of his learning and experience as a critic to explain and illustrate what is truly the text-book and the *vade-mecum* of the Christian, the exponent of his joys and sorrows. If we do not agree with all his views and expositions, yet we cannot but be pleased with the frankness with which he has avowed them, and the learning and skill with which he has in general supported them.

The work on China by Mr. S. Wells Williams, lately published by Wiley and Putnam, has reached a second edition. Such productions do honor to the country, both at home and abroad. These volumes are not the reproduction or skilful condensation of what was previously in print, but to a great extent the result of personal observation, and they thus constitute a positive addition to the sum of human knowledge. They are only one of a hundred valuable proofs which might be given of the impetus which the cause of science and general civilization is receiving at the hands of our foreign missionaries. For them, not only the wilderness and the solitary place are glad, but they are casting back a fresh illumination upon the lands already enjoying the lights of learning and of the gospel. Mr. Williams resided at Canton and Macao twelve years, as

a missionary printer, speaking the Chinese language familiarly, and in habits of daily intercourse with the natives. The work—in two large duodecimo volumes of nearly 1200 pages in all—gives abundant proof that he made good use of his eyes and ears. Minute detail—yet with orderly arrangement,—and conscientious accuracy appear to characterize the work in a high degree. It contains about forty illustrations of various matters and things relating to the celestial kingdom, including portraits of Dr. Abeel, and of Commissioner Keying. A large map of the empire is also prefixed. Indeed everything appears to have been done both by the author and publishers to give the work a permanent and standard value.

A cast of the Assyrian monuments discovered in Cyprus is to be sent from Berlin to the British Museum. Mr. Layard will soon publish an octavo volume on his discoveries in Nineveh. His drawings are to be published by subscription. Col. Rawlinson is continuing his researches on the Assyrian cuneïform inscriptions. The antiquities excavated by Mr. Layard will soon be removed from Bussorah to England *via* Bombay.

In the Allgem. Litt. Zeitung for Sept. 1847, is a short Review by Von Gabelentz of the Indian Languages of North America, and of various works published in some of these languages, particularly by the American Board. The writer considers himself fortunate in obtaining possession of books, Reports of the Board, the Missionary Herald, etc. which very seldom find their way to the learned scholars of Europe.

In the No. of the Bibliotheca Sacra for November last, we inserted a commendatory notice of Schmitz's History of Rome. We have seen no reason to alter or abate the terms of this commendation. Some errors may, doubtless, be detected in the History; some slips in the style of the English are quite apparent, for the author is a native of Germany; still, it is a trustworthy and very able Compend of Roman history, and altogether in advance of any work on the subject which is adapted to our schools and academies. The Andover edition is a reprint of the London, and professes to be nothing more. There was no editorial supervision, and the Advertisement prefixed virtually disclaims such supervision.

The following works have lately appeared in England: The Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament unfolded, and its points of coincidence or disagreement with prevailing systems indicated, by Samuel Davidson, LL. D. 1848. pp. 458. Gieseler's Compendium of Ecclesiastical History, tranlated from the 4th edition by S. Davidson, Vol. II. pp. 518. Hagenbach's Compendium of the History of Doctrines, translated by C. W. Buch, Vol II. pp. 496. The Phaedrus, Lysis and Protagoras of

Plato, translated by J. Wright. Dr. William Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology, will be completed in 5 vols. during the present year, price about $20. The 2nd edition of Dr. Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities will be published about midsummer. The fourth volume of the new edition of Thirlwall's History of Greece has been published; also the new Life of archbishop Usher, being the first volume of the new and complete edition of his works which has been for some years in a course of publication; and the second edition of An Introduction to the Grammar of the Sanskrit Language, for the use of early students, by H. H. Wilson, Professor of Sanskrit in the University of Oxford. Murray's Hand-Book for travellers in Egypt, London, 1847, being a new edition of Modern Egypt and Thebes, by Sir Gardner Wilkinson, is full of interesting information, both in respect to Ancient and Modern Egypt, greatly condensed, and brought down to the present time. Congregational Independency, in contradistinction from Episcopacy and Presbyterianism, the Church Polity of the New Testament, is the title of a small octavo by Rev. R. Wardlaw, D. D. of Glasgow.

Among the new works in the departments of Theology, Biblical Literature, etc., lately published, are:

Theodore Beza's Translation of the New Testament, G. S. Appleton, Philadelphia, 18mo.

Biographical Notices of some of the most distinguished Jewish Rabbies, and Translations of portions of their Commentaries and other Works, by Samuel H. Turner, D. D.

Festal Chimes and Sabbath Musings, or the Circle of the Christian year, translated from the German of Tholuck, by Edward Weyer, Rochester, E. Darrow.

The Life of Jesus Christ, in its Historical Connection and Historical Development, by Augustus Neander, translated from the 4th German edition, by Professors M'Clintock and Blumenthal of Dickinson College, Pa. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1848. pp. 450.

An Alphabetical Index to subjects treated in the Reviews and other periodical publications, to which no Indexes have been published, has been prepared by one of the Literary Societies of Yale College and will soon be published, price about fifty cents.

To the friends of German and Anglo-German Literature:—The undersigned begs leave respectfully to announce, that he has just commenced, in compliance with the wish of many friends, to publish, at Mercersburg, Penn., a monthly theological and ecclesiastical journal, in the German language. It is entitled, *Der Deutsche Kirchenfreund*, and is

designed of course to breathe a German spirit, though not under an exclusive or foreign character. Occasionally, perhaps, it may admit an article on general literature or science; but its field will be mainly the interests of living Christianity and the church, not in a sectarian or denominational view, but as embraced in the universal idea of Christ's kingdom. It is believed, that such a publication, rightly conducted, may with good reason challenge the attention, not only of intelligent Germans in this country, but of many liberal minded and intelligent English persons also, whose education happily qualifies them for making use of the German language as a medium of thought. Such can hardly fail to take some interest in a design, which proposes to make the German nationality as well as the English subservient, in its measure, to the intellectual and moral advancement of our own beloved land. The "Kirchenfreund" is ambitious to mediate, in some degree, between the German and English forms of thought, particularly in the important sphere of religion. The nature of the case requires, that it should appear in a popular rather than a strictly scientific character; still it is not intended exactly for the *people* in general, but for such rather as may be supposed to be capable of a somewhat cultivated interest in theological subjects. It will contain original essays, reviews of new works, especially such as are continually making their appearance in Germany, and summaries of intelligence, relating to the broad, catholic movements of the church, both theoretical and practical, whether in the old world or the new. Each number of the publication contains upwards of thirty pages, good paper and type. The price of subscription for the year, commencing with January, 1848, is *one dollar*, to be paid in advance. Subscriptions and remittances can be forwarded to the subscriber by mail, and will be thankfully acknowledged.

PHILIP SCHAFF.

Mercersburg, Franklin Co., Penn., Jan. 17, 1848.

ERRATA.

Feb. No. 1848. p. 91, In the title of the Art. for Great read *Greek;* p. 92, l. 21, for ann. L. I. read ann. LI.; same p 5th l. from bott. for last r. *least;* p. 89, lines 12 and 11 from bott. del. period after *river*, and read "down the river, half an hour below," etc.; p. 90, l. 4 of right hand inscription, read VOLVSVSI; p. 117, in the title to the Art., insert C after X; p. 119, reverse marginal references; p. 120, margin, for T. XL., r. TXI.; p. 121 and elsewhere, for Stilling r. *Stilling;* p. 122, bott. line, for Porte r. *Rome;* p. 124, 16th l. from bott., for three r. *fierce;* p. 127, 7th l. from bott., for liberal r. *literal;* p. 133, for adorer r. *advice;* p. 142, 2nd l. from bott., for favorite r. *fanatic;* p. 147, l. 4, for even r. *each;* l. 14, for exciting r. *existing;* p. 188, l. 4 from bott., for subjunctive r. *subject;* p. 337, l. 25, for passive r. *possessive;* p. 338, l. 1, for 16 r. 6; p. 339, l. 12, before 46 r. *Jer.*; p. 339, l. 14 from bott., for ἀπὰξ r. ἅπαξ; p. 340, l. 15, for 18 r. 8.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

AND

THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

NO. XIX.

AUGUST, 1848.

ARTICLE I.

DEPRESSION OF THE DEAD SEA AND OF THE JORDAN VALLEY.

By E. Robinson, D. D., Professor at New York.

[The following paper was drawn up in April, 1847; and was read before the New York Historical Society, at their meeting in June of the same year. In September following, a copy of it was transmitted to the Royal Geographical Society of London; but I am not informed, whether it has ever been brought to the notice of that Society.

In the meantime, the fact has been made known to the public through the newspapers, that Lieutenants Lynch and Dale of the U. S. Navy sailed in November, 1847, to join the squadron in the Mediterranean; having received permission from the government to make an excursion to the Dead Sea, in order to examine its remarkable phenomena, and also to survey its shores, as well as the whole valley of the Jordan. These gentlemen did me the honor to confer with me in respect to their plan; and the points of inquiry suggested in the present paper, among others, were in consequence brought to their notice. How far they will be able to carry out their plan, remains to be seen; but so far as they shall be permitted to proceed, the public have reason to expect a great accession of accurate and valuable information.—E. R.]

The deep depression of the Dead Sea below the Mediterranean, appears never to have been suspected down to the time of its actual discovery; and no experiments were ever made to ascertain the true level, until March, 1837. At that time, Messrs. Moore and Beke, in attempting a survey of the Dead Sea, were led to examine the question of its comparative elevation, by means of some experiments on the boiling point of water. They were greatly surprised at the

results; which indicated a depression of about *five hundred* English feet.[1] A month later, in April of the same year, Schubert's observations with the barometer gave the depression at about *six hundred* (598.5) Paris feet.[2]

In the following year, 1838, two barometrical measurements were taken. That of Bertou, a French traveller, gave to the sea a depression of 406 metres, or 1332 feet English.[3] The other, by Russegger, a German, indicated 1319 Paris feet, equal to 1400 feet English.[4]

The results of similar barometrical measurements for the level of the lakes of Tiberias and the Hûleh by Schubert and Bertou, exhibited a still greater diversity. The former made the depression of the first lake to be *five hundred and thirty-five* Paris feet; only sixty-five feet less than his estimate of that of the Dead Sea. Yet he made the Jordan at the bridge near the Hûleh to be 350 Paris feet *above* the Mediterranean; a difference of 880 French feet in the distance of about five miles![5] Bertou, on the other hand, gave the depression of the Lake of Tiberias at 230.3 metres, or 756 feet English; being 577 feet less than his estimate of that of the Dead Sea; while that of the Hûleh, according to him, is about 18 feet; implying a fall of 737 feet in the same five miles.[6]

Such was the state of the question, when the Biblical Researches in Palestine were published, in 1841. The preceding results were so greatly at variance, as to be utterly inconsistent with each other; and seemed in some respects to be equally so with the rapidity of the streams and the nature of the country. I therefore ventured, in that work, to suggest, that "so great is the uncertainty of all such partial measurements and observations, (as evinced in the like case of the Caspian Sea,) that the question can never be solved with exactness, until the intervening country shall have been surveyed, and the relative level of the two seas trigonometrically ascertained."[7] Such a measurement was afterwards understood to have been accomplished during that very year, 1841, by Lieut. Symonds of the British Royal Engineers. A very slight notice of his results was laid before the

[1] Journ. of R. Geogr. Soc. 1837, p. 456. Ib. 1839, p. lxiv.

[2] Schubert's Reise, III. p. 87. The proportion of the French foot to the English is as 16 to 15.

[3] Bulletin de la Soc. de Geogr. Oct. 1839, p. 161.

[4] Berghaus Annalen. Feb. u. März, 1839, p. 432.

[5] Schubert's Reise, III. p. 231, 259. The distance is here reckoned from the bridge to the alluvial tract below.

[6] Bulletin de la Soc. de Geogr. Oct. 1839, p. 161, 146, 145.

[7] Bibl. Res. II. p. 222.

Royal Geographical Society of London at their meeting, Jan. 24th, 1842.[1] One of the earliest accounts was published in this country in July, 1842, in the following extract of a letter from the Rev. Eli Smith to the writer, dated at Beirût, Feb. 7th, 1842.[2]

"I am happy to inform you that the altitude [depression] of the Dead Sea has been ascertained by exact trigonometrical measurement. Lieut. Symonds of the British Royal Engineers, surveyed the greater part of Judea and the region around the plain of Esdraelon; and while doing it, carried a double line of altitudes from the sea at Yâfa to Neby Samwîl, and thence another double line to the Dead Sea. He found the latter to be *thirteen hundred and thirty-seven* feet below the Mediterranean. By similar observations he ascertained the Lake of Tiberias to be *eighty-four* feet below the Mediterranean. These numbers he gave me himself; and at the same time showed me his calculations." The same statement of the ascertained depression of the two lakes (1337 feet and 84 feet) was communicated by M. von Wildenbruch, the Prussian Consul-general at Beirût, to the Royal Geographical Society of Berlin, during the same year, and published by them in their Monthly Report.[3]

In May of the same year, 1842, the President of the Royal Geographical Society of London, William R. Hamilton, Esq., in his annual address delivered before the Society and afterwards published in their Journal,[4] entered into some details respecting the manner in which the survey had been performed; to which we shall have occasion hereafter to recur. He also stated the results at 1311.9 English feet for the depression of the Dead Sea, and 328 feet for that of the Lake of Tiberias. The same distinguished gentleman in his annual address of the following year [1843], and also in his address on delivering one of the gold medals of the Society to Lieut. Symonds, gives the exact numbers at 1312.2 feet for the Dead Sea, and 328.1 feet for the upper Lake.[5] In commenting upon this difference of level between the two lakes, he makes the following remarks, which are worthy of grave consideration:[6]

"It cannot have escaped your notice, that there still remains to be executed in this part of the globe a very important and interesting operation, to account for the very great discrepancy of these figures. For it follows from these two ascertained levels, that there is a differ-

[1] Lond. Athenaeum, Jan. 29th, 1842.

[2] Bibl. Repository, June 1842; also in Biblioth. Sac. Feb. 1843, p. 16.

[3] Monatsbericht der Ges. für Erdk. zu Berlin, Jahrg. IV. p. 141, Nov. 1842.

[4] Journ. of the R. Geogr. Soc. 1842, p. lx, lxi.

[5] Ibid. 1843, p. xi, lxxiv.

[6] Ibid. p. lxxiv.

ence of nearly *one thousand feet* between the Lake of Tiberias and the Dead Sea, a distance in direct line of little more than one degree of latitude; which implies (the Jordan not being a meandering stream) a fall of more than *sixteen* feet in every mile of its course. This is in itself a very remarkable phenomenon, and calls for the early attention of travellers and geographers. The river has been frequently crossed, and is always noted as a rapid stream; but no cataracts or decided *rapids*, as such, have been observed; and no one has traced its banks from one of these points to the other."

It is the purpose of the present paper to draw attention to what Mr. Hamilton so justly calls "a very remarkable phenomenon;" and, by a reference to the ascertained fall of several other rivers in different parts of the globe, to present this phenomenon in its true light and proportions. The way will then be open to bring forward some considerations, which may seem to connect themselves with the result.

The immediate banks of the Jordan, as is said above, have never been fully traced between the two lakes; though travellers have passed along the whole length of the valley. Bertou in 1837 went from Tiberias to Jericho through the valley; and in 1844 the Rev. Eli Smith passed up from Jericho as far as to Wady el-Fâri'a north of the mountain called Kŭrn es-Sŭrtŭbeh. A copy of his unpublished Journal is now in my hands. The river has been frequently crossed at various points; and indeed, from the Lake of Tiberias as far down as to Beisân, may be regarded as well known. Irby and Mangles crossed near that lake, and again further down on the route from Om Keis to Beisân; and both they and Bertou describe the river as there "winding extremely" and having little current.[1] Buckingham relates, that in crossing the river four or five miles south of the lake, the water was so deep that the horses had to swim for a few minutes; the current here "winding slowly over a sandy and pebbly bed at the rate of a mile and a half an hour."[2]

Just below Beisân is a ford, where Burckhardt crossed in July; and found the water three feet deep. He says the river is fordable in many places in summer; but during the rainy season the spots where it may be forded are few.[3] Irby and Mangles, crossing at the same ford on the 12th of March, remark that the water reached above the bellies of the horses; and that the current was here much swifter than in the part nearer the Lake of Tiberias.[4] The same travellers a

[1] Irby and Mangles' Travels, Lond. 1845, p. 91. Bulletin de la Soc. de Geogr. Sept. Oct. 1839, p. 150.

[2] Trav. among the Arab Tribes, 4to. p. 7.

[3] Trav. in Syria, etc. p. 344.

[4] Trav. Lond. 1845, p. 92.

fortnight later, March 29th, in passing from es-Salt to Nâbulus, lost their way; and coming to the Jordan were surprised to find it very much swollen. The stream was exceedingly rapid, and so deep that they were obliged to swim their horses.[1] Buckingham, crossing with Mr. Bankes some distance above Jericho, early in February, found the river easily fordable; the stream was exceedingly rapid, flowing over a bed of pebbles.[2] The bathing-places of the pilgrims opposite Jericho have been often described; and the river there runs with a swift strong current, but without rapids. The same is true of the crossing-place visited by my own party further down; where I have described the Jordan as having "a still, though very rapid current;" so that our Egyptian servant, a stout swimmer of the Nile, was carried down several yards, in crossing. The water was here said to be ten or twelve feet deep; and the river is never passed at this point without swimming the horses.[3]

These notices all indicate a swift current of the river below Beisân; but still nothing in the nature of *rapids*. It must also be borne in mind, that the fording places are always the shallowest spots, where the current of course is the swiftest. Nor do the Arabs know of any rapids; nor have they ever reported any to travellers. It is however barely possible, that something of the kind may exist in that singular tract of the valley opposite to Kŭrn es-Sŭrtŭbeh. From the foot of that mountain a higher desert tract of land, or low ridge, extends across the valley; through which the Jordan finds its way in a deep ravine. Indeed, in the vicinity of the river the whole tract is broken up into a labyrinth of like ravines, with barren, chalky sides, forming a most wild and desolate scene. Burckhardt speaks of the same as "a chain of low calcareous rocky heights."[4] This portion of the river's course has never been minutely examined; though it is obvious, that if rapids exist even here, they can have no very unusual fall.

The flow of the Jordan is swift, deep, and silent; its waters emit no sound, neither roar nor murmur. Below Beisân its course has few if any windings. The direct distance between the two lakes may be taken at one degree of latitude, or sixty geographical miles; it being actually a little less according to the best maps. The difference of level between the lakes, as ascertained by Lieut. Symonds, is 984 English feet; giving therefore a fall of 16.4 feet in every geographical mile.

---

[1] Trav. Lond. 1845, p. 99. [2] Trav. in Palest. 8vo. II. pp. 92, 93.
[3] Bibl. Res. in Palest. II. p. 256. [4] Rev. E. Smith. Ms. Jour. Burckh. Syr. p. 347.

Let us now compare the known rate of descent in some other of the most rapid streams in the different parts of the world.

I. The Orontes. The elevation of the Lake of Antioch above the Mediterranean, as ascertained by the English engineers during Col. Chesney's expedition, is 365 English feet.[1] This lake lies opposite the elbow of the Orontes, where that river turns south-west; and the outlet of the lake enters the latter; so that the level of the river at the elbow differs very little if any from that of the lake. The direct course of the Orontes from its elbow to the sea, is about 24 geographical miles. This gives an average fall of nearly fifteen feet for every mile of the course below the bend, being nearly equal to that of the Jordan. But the stream differs greatly from the Jordan in its character. Below Antioch it passes through a mountain gorge with perpendicular walls; where the river "roars over its rocky bed" in a succession of rapids and shallows, which render it unnavigable even for steam vessels.[2] Further down, in the plain towards the sea, the river is in some places fordable; but is usually crossed by a ferry, and the current is very rapid.[3]

In the following notices of the Elbe, the Danube, and the Rhine, the measurements are taken from Stein's Geography, a popular German work of high authority.[4]

II. The Elbe. The elevation of this stream at its junction with the Moldau near Melnik in Bohemia, is 426 German feet;[5] at Schandau in the Saxon Switzerland, 320 feet; at Wittenberg, 204 feet. From Melnik to Schandau the distance is about 45 geographical miles, but the river varies considerably from a direct course; from Schandau to Wittenberg the course is more direct, and is about 95 geographical miles. Hence, according to these data, above Schandau, where the river breaks through the Erz mountains, the average fall in each direct geographical mile is $\frac{10.6}{4.5} = 2.3$ feet; and below Schandau where the river is still for some distance among the mountains, only $\frac{11.6}{9.5} = 1.2$ feet. Yet the Elbe is justly regarded as a very rapid stream.

III. The Danube. It is necessary here to include only that portion of the river which flows among mountains, and is the most rapid,

[1] Journ. R. Geogr. Soc. 1838, p. 416.

[2] Irby and Mangles, p. 70. Bowring's Report on Syria, p. 49. W. M. Thomson in Miss. Herald, 1841, p. 235.

[3] W. M. Thomson, ibid.

[4] C. G. D. Stein's Handbuch der Geographie; herausgeg. von F. Hörschelmann, 3 Bde. 8vo. Leipz. 1833–4. Sixth Edition.

[5] The proportion of the German (Rhenish) foot to the English is as 139.1 to 135; or nearly as 15.5 to 15.

viz. between Passau and Vienna. The elevation of the stream at Passau is 786 German feet; at Vienna 480 feet. The direct distance is nearest 130 geographical miles. The average descent therefore in each mile is $\frac{306}{130} = 2.3$ feet. Yet this tract comprises the celebrated *Strudel* and other rapids, formerly so much dreaded by the boatmen. Indeed, until the introduction of steam-navigation, the boats which descended the Danube were very rarely if ever taken back, but were broken up at the end of their voyage.

IV. The Rhine. This noble river we may look at in three different sections.

1. *Between Cologne and Mayence.* Here we find the celebrated scenery of the Rhine. The river flows between mountains, and is a bold and rapid stream. The elevation at Mayence is 256 German feet; at Cologne 112 feet; the distance between the two places nearest 90 geographical miles. The average fall therefore is $\frac{144}{90} = 1.6$ feet in each mile. Yet in this tract is the rapid at the Lurlei, the Bingerloch, and others; and so powerful is the current, that the steamers which descend from Mayence to Cologne in a day, for a long time took two days to return. Indeed, so late as 1827, the time of a steamer from Rotterdam to Strasburg was eight days; while the downward trip was made in forty hours.

2. *Between Mayence and Basel.* Here the Rhine pours its waters rapidly with very many windings through the immense plain. Its elevation at Basel is 755 German feet; at Mayence, as before, 256 feet; and the direct distance between the two cities about 158 geographical miles. This gives the average descent of $\frac{499}{158} = 3.1$ feet a mile; nearly double that of the straighter and more navigable portion below. The very winding course of the river, however, serves greatly to diminish the rapidity of the current.

3. *Between Basel and the Lake of Constance.* At Stein, situated at the foot of the lake, the elevation is 1200 German feet; at Basel, 755 feet; the direct distance between is about 56 geographical miles. The average fall is therefore eight feet in each mile of direct distance. But this section of the Rhine is the most rapid in the whole course of that river, after it loses its character of a mountain torrent in the Lake of Constance. Besides the strong rapid at Laufenberg, it includes the celebrated falls of Schaffhausen, from 75 to 80 feet in height. If these be deducted, the average fall is reduced to six feet the mile. This portion of the river is not navigated except by produce boats; and these are only pushed or towed up the current by main strength.

V. The Mohawk. If it should be said of the preceding streams, that the measurements depend merely on the barometer, and are

therefore of doubtful accuracy; yet in the present instance such an objection cannot be taken. The great Erie canal runs all the way along the bank of the Mohawk; and the measurements are the results of actual levellings and surveys in laying out that vast work. The elevation of the river at Rome above tide-water in the Hudson, was found to be 419 English feet.[1] The direct distance from Rome along the valley of the Hudson is not less than 95 geographical miles. This gives the average fall in each mile at $\frac{419}{95} = 4.4$ feet. The Mohawk is everywhere full of ripples and rapids; and probably every one who has seen the two rivers, would regard it as a more rapid stream than the Jordan. The above measurement comprises also the falls of the Cohoes, having a descent of seventy feet; and the Little Falls, where the water descends 42 feet in half a mile. Deducting these, the average fall of the river is reduced to 3.4 feet the mile.

VI. The Missouri. At the Great Falls of the Missouri, 2500 miles above its junction with the Mississippi, it is stated, that the river descends 357 feet in 18 miles by a succession of falls; the greatest fall being 87 feet perpendicular, and the next 47 feet.[2] This would give the average fall in each mile at not quite 20 feet.

Recapitulation.

	Fall per mile.
The Jordan, without rapids and usually deep,	16.4 feet.
The Orontes, "roaring over its rocky bed," with shallows,	15 "
The Elbe, above Schandau,	2.3 "
" " from Schandau to Wittenberg,	1.2 "
The Danube, above Vienna, with rapids	2.3 "
The Rhine, Lower Section, with rapids,	1.6 "
" " Middle Section,	3.1 "
" " Upper Section, with Falls,	8 "
The Mohawk, with many rapids and Falls,	4.4 "
The Missouri, at the Great Falls,	20 "

Thus it appears, that of all these streams, the only ones which can be compared with the Jordan in rapidity of descent, are the Great Falls of the Missouri, and the lower part of the Orontes, which flows over rocks and is unnavigable. The Rhine, in its most rapid portion and including the falls of Schaffhausen, has but one half the average descent of the Jordan. The Mohawk with its many rapids and falls, has but one fourth part of the same descent. The Jordan, so far as known, has neither cataracts nor rapids; and its flow, though swift, is silent. Yet in the 984 feet of its descent in 60 geographical miles,

[1] N. Y. Canals: Laws and Documents, Vol. I. p. 268. Albany, 1825.

[2] Haskell and Smith's Gazetteer, p. 416.

there is room for THREE CATARACTS, *each equal in height to* NIAGARA; and still leave to the river an average fall equal to the swiftest portion of the Rhine, including the cataract of Schaffhausen!

All this sufficiently attests, that the descent of the Jordan, so far as ascertained, does indeed present, in the language of Mr. Hamilton, "in itself a very remarkable phenomenon." And it is hardly to the credit of the scholars and learned societies of western Europe, to whom the Holy Land is now brought within an easy journey of a few days, that *four years* should already have been suffered to elapse since attention was thus publicly called to this important problem, without the slightest effort having been made, so far as the public are informed, to arrive at its solution.

In the absence therefore of all further observations, and in view of the striking anomaly thus presented by the Jordan as it respects all other like rapid streams, I venture to suggest,—not certainly in a spirit of doubt or want of confidence in the distinguished engineer, but solely in behalf of the interests of science,—Whether, after all, there may not be a possibility, that some slight element of defect or inaccuracy may have entered into the observations or calculations, and thus have affected the correctness of the result? The question would seem to be a fair one here, between the possibility of some such error on the one side, and the probability of so immense a contrast with all similar physical phenomena, so far as known, on the other.

The following account of the manner in which the observations were made, is given by the President of the Royal Geographical Society in his annual address for 1842; and is the only one I have yet seen.[1] Lieut. Symonds being furnished with an excellent seven-inch theodolite, "measured a base from the Martyrs' Tower near Ramleh, on the plain of Jaffa, on which he founded his triangulation for the south portion of his district; and, finding the instrument sufficiently nicely divided in its vertical arc, he was enabled to ascertain the relative levels of his various points with great accuracy. He then worked with his triangulation towards the head of the Dead Sea, taking at every station a very accurate series of vertical angles, the mean of which he worked on, making the necessary allowances for refraction and curvature; but, owing to the want of another instrument, and a competent person to take simultaneous observations, he could not ascertain what the former was, and had to assume it at one twelfth of the subtended angle from the earth's centre, which he considers to be very near the truth. Lieut. Symonds completed the levels in this manner by two different lines, from Jaffa to Neby Samuel, the high-

[1] Journal of the Royal Geogr. Society 1842, p. lx.

est point of the Jerusalem range, the one checking the other, and found the difference but trifling. From thence he started on the same plan to the Dead Sea, and with nearly as good success; the two levels differing from eleven to twelve feet. Owing to the unfavorable nature of the ground about Jerusalem, and the cliffs overhanging the plains of Jericho, Lieut. Symonds could not carry the two lines of level, independently of each other, to the required spot; which might have been done in spite of the natural difficulties, had he had better assistance than he could procure from Bedouins. The work occupied him nearly ten weeks; though the distance traversed was not more than forty-seven miles, the direct distance from Jaffa to the Dead Sea."

It appears from this statement, that the observations consisted in a double series of vertical angles, connected apparently (at least sometimes) with long distances. The survey therefore was not carried on by the process of levelling usually employed in laying out the course of a canal or rail-road. However exact therefore the observations may have been in themselves, yet no one probably will suppose, that this method of survey would ever be adopted, or in any way relied on, in undertaking any great public work, like a rail-road or canal, where the ascertaining of the true level was essential.

It appears also, that the refraction could not be determined, but was assumed hypothetically at a certain amount in the calculations. The atmosphere of Palestine is dry and singularly transparent; so that objects situated at a great distance appear as if comparatively near at hand. It would seem, not unnatural that this should have an effect upon the amount of refraction, and cause it to be different from that which exists in the more humid atmospheres of England and other countries; and this difference it might require a series of careful observations to determine accurately. Especially would it seem important to take into account the peculiar degree of refraction near the Dead Sea and along the Jordan valley; where from the greater depression of the surface, the atmosphere must naturally be much more dense than in any other known portion of the globe.

It would seem further, that there existed an important discrepancy between the results of the earliest calculations, and those subsequently published. In the statements reported from Beirût to this country by the Rev. Eli Smith, and to Berlin by Mr. von Wildenbruch the Prussian Consul-general, and derived from Lieut. Symonds himself, the depression of the Lake of Tiberias is given at only 84 feet; while the later publication makes it 328 feet; a difference of 244 feet. This would give for the difference of the two lakes 1228 feet; and

would raise the average fall of the Jordan in each mile to 20 feet. How this difference arose, we are not informed; it may have been by varying some one or more of the assumed elements in the calculation.

There is another circumstance, which perhaps is hardly of sufficient importance to be adduced here; and yet, under a certain aspect, it is not without some weight. There exists a Plan of Jerusalem, published by John Weale, London 1844, and marked as "surveyed by Lieuts. Aldrich and Symonds, Royal Engineers." This plan differs from every other in the form and extent of the Haram-area, the site of the ancient Jewish temple. The eastern side of that area, according to the independent measurements of Mr. Catherwood, of Messrs. Tipping and Wolcott, and of the Rev. Eli Smith in 1844, is 1525 feet in length; the plan in question gives it at 1400 feet. The southern side of the same area according to the measurements of the same gentlemen, is not less than 912 feet; while it is laid down on this plan at only 830 feet; the northern end being given at about 1060 feet. Above all, the western side of the area, instead of being marked as a straight line, as is done correctly in every plan of Jerusalem from D'Anville to Schultz, is here represented as being drawn in towards the southern end by two rectangular offsets, one of 100 feet, and the other of 130 feet. That no such offsets exist, is a matter of public notoriety to all who have ever visited Jerusalem; and it is difficult to understand, how such a representation can ever have come to be connected with the names of scientific engineers. No doubt the matter can be, and perhaps has already been, satisfactorily explained; otherwise, it is easy to perceive, that it might have some bearing upon a judgment of the present question.

Taking into consideration all the circumstances thus far adduced, there certainly does seem ground sufficient for the suggestion of a doubt, whether the problem of the depression of the Dead Sea and Jordan valley is yet fully solved. Or if a re-examination should confirm the accuracy of the former results, there still remains the "remarkable phenomenon" of the great descent of the Jordan to be investigated and explained. Either of these objects alone would be worthy the attention of European governments; combined as they are, they ought not to remain uninvestigated another year. It would be a small thing for England, or France, or Prussia, to send out an expedition for this purpose; and it may be hoped, that the Geographical Societies which adorn the capitals of those countries, will not let the matter rest, until it shall be fully accomplished.

The survey ought to be conducted in the same method, and with

all the caution and accuracy, usually required in laying out the route of a canal or rail-way. It might be carried across the mountains, from Jaffa by Jerusalem to the north end of the Dead Sea; or perhaps better from Gaza by way of Beersheba to the Dead Sea, either opposite the long peninsula or further south. This latter course would avoid the mountains, except the descent to the Dead Sea itself. The survey ought likewise to take in the course of the Jordan between the two lakes, as also the tract between the Lake of Tiberias and the Mediterranean near Haifa. These three different routes would mutually check and prove each other.

In the same connection it would be exceedingly desirable to extend the survey to the upper sources of the Jordan above Hasbeiya, and to include also the valley of the Bûkâ'a between Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon, connecting it with the Mediterranean on the north of Lebanon, and perhaps also near Tyre along the course of the river Lîtâny. There is here a remarkable configuration of the earth's surface, respecting which we have as yet no accurate knowledge.

There is at least one interesting problem yet to be solved in this region, in determining the elevation of the Bûkâ'a above the sea. From barometrical measurements taken at Ba'albek, this elevation is given by Schubert at 3572 Paris feet; by Russegger at 3496 Paris feet; equivalent in English feet to 3810 and 3729 feet respectively.[1] Near Ba'albek rises the Lîtâny, which flows south and west to the Mediterranean near Tyre. Just north of Ba'albek is the low water-shed in the valley; and beyond it the sources of the Orontes, which runs north to the parallel of Antioch, and then bends round southwestwards to the sea. We have already seen, that the average fall of this stream below its elbow is 15 feet in the geographical mile. The elevation of its remotest source near Lebweh cannot vary much from that of Ba'albek, or 3729 English feet, taking the estimate of Russegger; while we have already seen the elevation at the elbow to be 365 feet. The difference gives the fall of the river between those points at 3364 feet, in the direct distance of nearest 128 geographical miles. This is equal to an average fall of 26.4 feet in each mile; or nearly double the rate of fall in the same river (15 feet) below its elbow. This result is quite incompatible with the greater comparative rapidity of the Orontes in its lower portion; and also with the general features of the country and the extensive marshes along its upper valley. The barometrical measurement of the Bûkâ'a is therefore probably too high.

The same inference is confirmed by comparing the course of the

[1] Schubert's Reise, III. p. 322. Russegger's Reise, I. p. 702.

Lîtâny. From Ba'albek to the sea its direct course is nearest 55 geographical miles. It flows at first along the alluvial valley; then breaks through the southern spurs of Lebanon by a deep chasm for about 20 miles, much of the way over a rocky bed and with a rushing and foaming stream; and at last flows to the sea with many windings through a broad low tract of meadow land. If now for this 20 miles of chasm, we assume an average fall in the mile of 100 feet, or 2000 feet in all, (which is a very large allowance, greater indeed than the rate of descent at the Little Falls of the Mohawk,) there yet remains of the elevation at Ba'albek (3729 English feet) no less than 1729 feet to be distributed along the rest of the course, or 35 geographical miles. This gives an average fall of very nearly 50 feet in a mile, in a course mostly along alluvial vallies. This result, therefore, goes strongly to confirm that found above in the case of the Orontes; and both together would seem to afford decisive proof, that the reported elevation of the Bûkâ'a must be greatly exaggerated.

Let us hope that public attention may be called to the various points referred to in this paper; and that those who have it in their power, will speedily cause these questions to be put at rest forever.

ARTICLE II.

ALLEGED ANACHRONISM IN ACTS 5: 36 IN RELATION TO THE SEDITION OF THEUDAS.

Translated from the German by H. B. Hackett, Professor in Newton Theol. Institution.

[Introductory Note. The original Article is contained in the "Theologische Studien und Kritiken," edited by Ullmann and Umbreit; Jahrgang, 1837, drittes Heft, p. 622 sq. The title there is—Theudas, der Aufruehrer, Apstlg. 5: 36. Von Dr. Friedrich Sonntag, Grossherzoglich Badischem Kirchen-und Ministerialrathe. In the translation the object has been to convey faithfully the sense of the original, but without being bound by the form of the German sentences.—Tr.]

§ 1.

The anachronism charged on Luke, which forms the subject of the present investigation, occurs in the speech of Gamaliel delivered before the Jewish Sanhedrim, as recorded in Acts 5: 35—39. The apostles, among whom Peter appears as specially prominent, stood

arraigned before this body on account of the courageous testimony which they had borne to the resurrection of Christ, and their death was now demanded by many of the members as the penalty of their offence. Under these circumstances Gamaliel, so revered for his personal character and learning, arose and admonished his associates not to proceed with such rigor, but to release the accused without punishment. Belonging to the party of the Pharisees, and entertaining fully their belief of a divine fatality, everywhere and always active in the concerns of men, he remarked to the assembly that if the undertaking of the apostles was a human affair, it would not stand; but, on the other hand, if founded in the purposes of God, that it could not be overthrown. To enforce this advice, he reminded them of two insurrectionists who had formerly risen up among the people before the apostles appeared, as promulgators of the gospel, but who had perished and their schemes with them. "*Before these days,*" says the speaker, "*arose Theudas, saying that himself was some one of importance, to whom a number of men, about four hundred, joined themselves; who was slain, and all those who obeyed him were dispersed, and came to nothing. After this one arose Judas the Galilean, in the days of the taxing, and drew away many people after him; and he also, and all who obeyed him, were scattered.*"

From these words of Gamaliel we perceive, in the first place, that the Theudas named by him, who appeared at the head of about four hundred men, was an insurrectionist. Since men only are expressly mentioned who attached themselves to him, we have reason to infer that Theudas was not a person who merely sought to lead the people astray by false doctrine, but that he endeavored, at the head of his party, to accomplish his designs by violence.

So too, we must conclude from the language of Gamaliel, that this Theudas belonged to the number of insurgents at that time, who were specially noted. With this agrees also the circumstance that Gamaliel classes him with Judas the Galilean, in respect to whom, we learn from Josephus,[1] that soon after Archelaus[2] was deposed, in the year 759 from the foundation of Rome, or the year 6 of the Christian era, he instigated a powerful rebellion against the Romans, at the time of the assessment then taken by command of the emperor Augustus. Besides, it is not to be supposed that when the speaker wished to call attention to the certainty of the failure of enterprises undertaken rashly and in opposition to the divine plan, and in this connection to adduce

[1] Arch. L. 18, c. 8, § 1. De Bel. Jud. L. 2, c. 8, § 1.

[2] According to Dio Cassius, L. 55, c. 27. p. 801, ed. Reimar.

examples of revolutionists who had failed in their attempts, he would select these examples from the number of the less noted instances of such defeat. On the contrary, it lies in the nature of the case, that with this object in view, he would remind his hearers of individuals who had once rendered themselves notorious, and excited great expectation or great apprehension. We ought not to overlook also the fact, that Gamaliel attaches to the Theudas mentioned by him, the epithet *ὁ Γαλιλαῖος*, and distinguishes the time in which he appeared, still more particularly by the words *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς ἀπογραφῆς*, but mentions the Theudas likewise adduced by him without any nearer designation. Manifestly, Gamaliel supposed the entire assembly addressed by him to be familiar with the case of Theudas; and at the time when he spoke, no second Theudas had come before the public as a revolutionist, with whom the first could have been confounded. The Judas mentioned by him must also have been known to the council; but the reason, without doubt, why Gamaliel took pains to describe him more closely, was that he might distinguish him from a demagogue of the same name, who had appeared some ten years before, namely, from the Judas, the son of Ezekias, of whom Josephus has given us information, Arch. L. 17, c. 10, § 5, and de Bel. Jud. L. 2, c. 4, § 1.

It results, further, from the words of Gamaliel, that the Theudas adduced by him, entertained probably a high conceit of himself, and in accordance with this, sought to play a distinguished part in the eyes of the nation. This may be inferred from the words—*λέγων εἶναί τινα ἑαυτὸν*, in which words, as was shown long ago by Kypke, Kuinoel and others, with an appeal to the Greek usage, is contained the idea that he gave himself out as something great and important. While in Gamaliel's speech no intimation whatever occurs, that Judas the Galilean exhibited a spirit which would mark him as an arrogant, ambitious man, and while in Josephus, also, this Judas appears as a person who in his efforts to stir up the Jews to revolt, aimed to restore the ancient constitution and independence of the country, rather than to secure any personal end of his own; on the other hand, Theudas appears more as a self-seeking aspirant, who at the head of the men devoted to him, sought to secure to himself great authority among the people.

Besides this, it is not to be doubted, according to the words of Gamaliel, that Theudas with his company met with a disastrous end. He was slain—*ἀνῃρέθη*, and his followers were dispersed and came to nothing—*διελύθησαν καὶ ἐγένοντο εἰς οὐδέν*. Those who escaped alive after the death of their leader, broke up their connection with

one another, and disappeared without further influence or observation. Judas the Galilean also perished—*ἀπώλετο*, and his followers too were entirely scattered—*διεσκορπίσθησαν*. But it is remarkable that Gamaliel does not add the words with reference to the adherents of Judas—*καὶ ἐγένοντο εἰς οὐδέν*. The ground of this lies in the fact, that the scattered remnant of the party of Judas continued after his destruction, as we learn from Josephus, to work on still in secret, and labored to maintain his free spirit and reckless principles among the people. Hence the speaker could not say of this party, that they came to nothing. The faction of Theudas only could be considered as annihilated, because every trace of this faction after the death of their leader, entirely vanished.

Finally, in respect to the time in which Theudas presented himself, Gamaliel says—*πρὸ τούτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἀνέστη Θευδᾶς*, i. e. *before these days in which we now live, before the time in which the apostles came forward, arose Theudas.* How long it was before this time, the speaker does not say; and it was not necessary that he should say, since he addressed those whom he could suppose to possess already a knowledge of the affair. But since Gamaliel subjoins that Judas arose after Theudas—*μετὰ τοῦτον*, and since he designates the Judas intended by him, as was remarked above, as the Galilean who rose up in the days of the taxing, in order to distinguish him from another adventurer of the same name, it is evident that Theudas appeared some years earlier than Judas the Galilean, and ran his dangerous career before the taxing alluded to in the Acts of the Apostles. If now we go back from the days in which Judas the Galilean arose to the period which preceded, we come at the distance of ten years to the time of Herod's death, when the country was infested by outlaws, so as to be full of the most terrible commotion. As in addition to Judas the Galilean, Gamaliel wished to present still another remarkable example of unsuccessful agitation, and one, too, drawn from earlier days, he would hardly be expected to pass over the time which immediately followed the death of the first Herod, since this time offerred to him so many distinguished examples of this kind, and since during the long period next preceding, in which Herod governed the country as king, no year presents itself in which we could with equal reason place the outbreak of Theudas. Hence our view is, as has been maintained before now by several learned men, that Theudas is one of those insurgents who appeared under the emperor Augustus, in the year of the death of Herod, i. e. in the year of Rome 750, and consequently ten years before the time of Judas the Galilean. At all events, the statement of Gamaliel requires that we should not place

the Theudas who came before Judas later than in the days of the emperor Augustus.

Perhaps it may seem, however, to justify some surprise, that Gamaliel should present to the attention of the Sanhedrim these examples of disappointed political machination, inasmuch as the aims and labors of the apostles were not directed at all to the accomplishment of political changes, but solely to the advancement of the spiritual kingdom of their Lord. But it does not follow, because Gamaliel in his speech associated the two factionists with the apostles, that he himself regarded the apostles as men of a similar character. What we may, however, infer from this with truth is, that their opponents in the assembly who desired the death of the apostles, wished to represent them as actual traitors, or, at least, as persons politically dangerous, whose conduct would bring on confusion and ruin; and under this pretence they demanded their death. This was, indeed, but the old malicious falsehood which the rulers of the Jews had already alleged against Christ (Luke 23: 5), and which they themselves at a later period employed against the apostle Paul (Acts 24: 5). In this way it can be easily explained, how Gamaliel found himself led to refer to the examples which have been cited. He wished by this course to admonish the council that they, who, besides this, at the time of the Roman dominion, possessed no power over life and death, had no occasion to proceed in so unauthorized and violent a manner against the apostles; because if they really entertained treasonable intentions, or should they occasion any disturbance, it was certain they could not escape the destruction which then awaited them. Gamaliel first warns the members of the Sanhedrim, that they should take heed to themselves as to what they would do to these men. He then reminds them of the unhappy fate which befel the factious Theudas and Judas, without any interposition on their part, and thus at the same time reminds them of the destruction which the apostles also must expect, if they were similar people. He then exhorts them, once more, to refrain from the apostles, and remarks in general, that their work if it was an affair of men, would certainly perish. He adds then, the emphatic and significant words: *But if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it.* It scarcely needs to be observed here, that Luke has not communicated to us the entire speech of Gamaliel, but only its most important contents.

§ 2.

But it has appeared to some learned men a circumstance of serious import, that Josephus in his historical works has taken no notice of

a Theudas, who made his appearance under Augustus, either there where he speaks of the fearful commotions[1] excited in the year of Herod's death or in any other passage, and that the first mention of an impostor named Theudas, which occurs in the Jewish historian, makes him appear in the reign of the emperor Claudius.

The case stands thus: The emperor Augustus had long since departed from the theatre of life; Tiberius, also, in some of the last years of whose reign Gamaliel delivered his speech, was dead; even Caligula had already been put to death, and Claudius had ascended the throne, before we read of any Theudas in the pages of Josephus. Almost fifty years had passed since the death of the first Herod, and almost forty since the outbreak of the notorious Judas the Galilean, and from ten to twelve or even more since the speech uttered by Gamaliel, when in the time of the Roman procurator Cuspius Fadus who, as is well known, governed Judea after the death of king Agrippa the First, the Theudas spoken of by Josephus appeared on the stage, and consequently between the years 44 and 47 A. D. performed the part related of him.

The account which Josephus has given of this man in his Archeology L. 20, c. 5, § 1, amounts to this. In the time of Fadus mentioned above, an impostor—*γόης* as he is termed, named Theudas, rose up, who gave himself out to be a prophet. He persuaded many people (*τὸν πλεῖστον ὄχλον*) to follow him with their movable effects to the Jordan, and promised them that at his command the stream should divide itself and afford them an easy passage. But Fadus despatched a company of troops after him; these fell upon him and his adherents unexpectedly, slew many of the people, and took many of them together with Theudas himself prisoners, and so put an end to the disorder. Theudas was afterwards executed, and his head carried to Jerusalem.

In consequence of this statement in Josephus, and his silence with reference to any earlier Theudas, several scholars have been led to conjecture that no insurgent bearing this name ever lived in the days of the emperor Augustus, and that the one mentioned in the Acts is the same person who is mentioned by Josephus, and who belonged to the time of the emperor Claudius. We find this view entertained among others by Calvin, Valesius and de Wette, but in the case of each of these critics with a particular modification.

Calvin in his Commentary on Acts 5: 36, thinks that the examination of the Apostles mentioned in that chapter did not occur, and consequently that the speech of Gamaliel was not delivered before the time of the government of the emperor Claudius, and of the procura-

[1] Arch. L. 17, c. 10; de Bel. Jud. L. 2, c. 3. 4 and 5.

tor Fadus, and after the Theudas mentioned in Josephus had already appeared; and hence he supposes that what Gamaliel said in Acts 5: 36, refers to this Theudas who had appeared under Claudius. But it is said in Gamaliel's speech that Judas the Galilean appeared later than Theudas; a difficulty from which Calvin seeks to free himself by ascribing to the words—*μετὰ τοῦτον*, a different sense from the one which they ordinarily express. He affirms that by these words Gamaliel did not intend to say that Judas the Galilean appeared after Theudas, but merely that besides Theudas, Judas also arose; so that according to this interpretation the sedition of Judas might have occurred in fact before the other. Particula post, says Calvin, tantundem valet atque *insuper* vel *praeterea*. But manifestly Calvin's view respecting this passage is entirely untenable. His opinion stands in direct contradiction with the chronological order of the Acts; for according to this order the examination of the apostles related in the fifth chapter took place undeniably several years earlier than the death of king Agrippa the First, mentioned in the twelfth chapter; and it was not until after the death of this king in the year 44, as we learn from Josephus, that Fadus came as procurator to Judea, under whose administration the Theudas of whom Josephus speaks acquired his notoriety. Besides, the explanation of the words *μετὰ τοῦτον*, given by Calvin, cannot be reconciled with the usage of the Greek language.

With still greater license, Valesius in his Annotations on Eusebius[1] considers it possible that Luke may have expressed himself *κατὰ πρόληψιν*; and thus by a bold and conscious anachronism, represented Gamaliel who spoke in the reign of Tiberius, as referring to Theudas, though the latter did not appear before the time of Claudius, because Luke considered the reference as appropriate to Gamaliel's speech in other respects. On account of the difficulty which lies in the words *μετὰ τοῦτον*, Valesius assumes that in Gamaliel's discourse Theudas as the one who appeared later, stands nearer to the time in which Gamaliel spoke, and Judas the Galilean who appeared earlier, follows as the more remote. The mode of viewing their position, in other words, is the inverse one; we reckon, not in the ordinary way, from the men who are spoken of downwards to the speaker, but backwards from the speaker to the men. Thus, according to Valesius, the sense of the words *μετὰ τοῦτον* is not that Judas arose after Theudas, but that he appears to us as standing behind him as we look towards the past from the present, and, consequently, that he preceded him in the order of manifestation. .That this explanation is in the highest degree

[1] Annot. ad Euseb. Hist. Eccles. L. 2, c. 11, p. 30—32.

forced and contrary to the well known usage of the phrase, hardly needs to be remarked. In addition to this, the view of Valesius conflicts with the character of Luke for candor and honesty. If Luke allowed himself in such an arbitrary and inconsiderate use of the facts of history, as to put into the mouth of Gamaliel words which Luke himself knew that Gamaliel never uttered, the credibility of his history would be entirely destroyed. One must impute also to the writer of the Acts in this case the inconceivable temerity of trifling in the most thoughtless manner with his claims to respect and confidence among his contemporaries, since very many of them must have known perfectly well the time of so noted an event as the sedition of Theudas. The sufficient motive also to such an act of inconsideration was wanting. Had Luke been capable of inserting an argument or illustration in the speech of Gamaliel, which the latter did not employ, he could have found examples enough from an earlier period, and especially from the time of Augustus, which he could have used more easily and safely.

Agreeing with Calvin and Valesius in their opinion, that no Theudas who was an insurrectionist lived in the days of Augustus, de Wette does not hesitate to charge the author of the Acts with having violated the truth of history. This assertion is free from the difficulties which attend the other explanations that have been noticed, but gives rise to others of a different kind, so serious, that we cannot admit the idea of such a mistake on the part of Luke as possible. According to de Wette's opinion, if we correctly understand it, Luke has erred in a two-fold way. In the first place, he has committed the gross oversight of having put back the Theudas who appeared under the emperor Claudius to the days of the emperor Augustus,—fifty years too soon,—and before Judas the Galilean whom he followed; an oversight which would so be much the more surprising, since this younger Theudas appeared on the stage after Luke had already reached the period of youth, or perhaps even of manhood, and since the bloody event, and the disastrous end of the impostor in the time of Fadus, after a comparative tranquillity had prevailed in Palestine since the last years of Augustus, must as something new and extraordinary have excited great attention and have been well known. In this connection too it is not to be forgotten, that according to the statement of Josephus, the head of the executed criminal was brought to the capital Jerusalem, where besides many other Christians, the apostles also and the companions of the apostles were accustomed at that time to reside. So then, in the second place, Luke has made himself chargeable with the egregious error of representing the well known Gama-

liel, the teacher of his friend Paul, as speaking in the time of Tiberius about an event which did not take place till the days of the emperor Claudius. Such a monstrous, two-fold error in the case of a writer like Luke, under the relations in which he lived, is not to be supposed. So ignorant in the history of his age, Luke was not; on the contrary, he possessed an accurate and fundamental knowledge not only of the geography but the history of his times; as any one may see from the Acts of the Apostles, where under circumstances which put his accuracy to the severest test, we meet continually with the most decisive evidence of his exact information in such matters.[1] Assuredly, the author of the Acts who had so much at heart, the sacred cause of Christianity, for which he lived, labored and suffered; he whom the apostle Paul deemed worthy of his confidential and long continued intercourse, and who at the commencement of his gospel as the first part of the original history of Christianity, which he felt himself called to write, gives us the assurance that he sought to investigate everything carefully (Luke 1: 3), cannot possibly in writing the second part of his work, the Acts of the Apostles, have been so negligent, indifferent, and thoughtless in regard to things intimately connected with a cause so sacred to him, as to have committed the unheard of, double mistake with which he is charged. By such negligence he would have brought into danger, or have lost all the confidence which he possessed with his readers. In this way Luke did not treat history. His narratives contain proofs of a conscientious pains-taking and accuracy, which show themselves in the most favorable light, when we compare his statements and allusions of a geographical or historical nature with the testimonies of other writers. Even the very fact that he presents to us no great *mass* of materials in regard to the establishment and extension of the church, and the deeds and fortunes of the apostles, allows us to draw for him a favorable conclusion in this particular. Certainly there were at that time, when he wrote the Acts of the Apostles, many more narratives and

[1] Tholuck in his *Glaubwürdigkeit der evangelischen Geschichte* has collected some illustrations of this remark, which he has presented in a very striking light. See e. g. pp. 161—177, 375—389. Lardner also in the first part of his *Credibility of the Gospel History* has traversed the same ground still more extensively. The well-informed reader who will study carefully the book of the Acts, and compare the incidental notices to be found there on almost every page with the political and physical geography of the times, and with the national customs of the Greeks, Romans, and Jews,—for the scene changes continually from land to land, from nation to nation,—may receive as strong an impression of the truth and fidelity of the writer, and hence of the truth of the gospel history in general, as was ever produced by the best treatise ever written on the Christian Evidences.—Tr.

traditions respecting the church and the apostles in circulation; but from the circumstance that he confines himself to the communication of a comparatively small number of facts, it is evident that he did not go to work blindly in reference to what he relates, but with consideration, scrutiny and selection; and, at least, that he could not have erred in so gross a manner as is affirmed. We have in his honesty and hearty zeal for the cause of Christianity, a sufficient pledge that he would tell the truth. We cannot so much as conceive of a reason why he should not have been disposed in the case of Gamaliel's speech to relate the truth. Then, again, he lived in relations which gave him an opportunity to ascertain what Gamaliel had said at the trial of the apostles; for he was for many years the trusted friend and the companion of the apostle Paul, who, having been a pupil of Gamaliel and a persecutor of the Christians, must have been initiated into the plans of the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem. Besides this, there were many Jews of rank, some of whom were already inclined in secret to Christianity, and others of whom, after Gamaliel had spoken the well-known words, attached themselves to the Christian faith; see John 12: 42. Acts 6: 7. In this manner Luke could have obtained certain and authentic information concerning the expressions of Gamaliel. Indeed, on general grounds, it is hardly conceivable how merely among the contemporaries of a Theudas who lived under the emperor Claudius, the error could have sprung up that he lived under Augustus, and that Gamaliel had spoken of him in the time of Tiberius.

§ 3.

Caesar Baronius also once held that the Theudas referred to in the Acts of the Apostles was the same person mentioned in Josephus, but according to his view it was not Luke who has fallen into an error but Josephus.[1] With him agrees L. Cappellus (who is represented, however, by Kuinoel as having expressed elsewhere another opinion), in his Compendium Historiae Judaicae, which he published as an appendix to his Historia Apostolica in the year 1634. In a Note, p. 117, Capellus says expressly in respect to the history of Theudas related by Josephus: In alienum tempus huc retulisse videtur Josephus historiam istam, quam necesse est prius contigisse, siquidem Gamaliel Actor. 5, 36 ejus meminit circa finem anni ultimi Tiberii. Even Valesius himself, notwithstanding his opinion mentioned above, was not

[1] Baron. Annal. Eccles. a. 1, c. 57;—a. 34, c. 272.

disinclined to suppose an error possible on the part of Josephus, as may be seen from his remarks on Eusebius.

On this supposition, Josephus would by an oversight have placed the Theudas who appeared under Augustus in the days of the emperor Claudius, and hence about fifty years too late. Even such an oversight would have been not inconsiderable, since Josephus, although somewhat younger than Luke, lived likewise under the emperor Claudius. Josephus was born in the first year of the reign of Caligula,[1] and was therefore about nine years of age when the Theudas whom he mentions, performed the part ascribed to him. The mistake thus committed by Josephus would not, however, be a two-fold one, and not so flagrant as that imputed to Luke, and so far might be considered as more possible. We must also take into consideration here another circumstance which deserves attention. Josephus wrote his history of the Jewish war after the destruction of Jerusalem; and yet here he has not recorded a word of any Theudas who appeared under Claudius at the time of the procurator Fadus, although such a notice would have found its appropriate place in this work, in which he describes not only the war itself, but its gradual development, and the various tumults and disturbances which preceded it. Indeed, he even assures us in the work just named, that the procurators Cuspius Fadus and Tiberius Alexander preserved the people in peace, and that it was not until the procuratorship of Cumanus that the disturbances again commenced; for in reference to the two former he says, de Bel. Jud. L. 2, c. 11, § 6: *οἱ μηδὲν παρακινοῦντες τῶν πατρίων ἐθῶν, ἐν εἰρήνῃ τὸ ἔθνος διεφύλαξαν*; and in reference to Cumanus he says, L. 2, c. 12, § 1: *ἐφ' οὗ θόρυβοί τε ἤρξαντο καὶ φθορὰ πάλιν Ἰουδαίων ἐγένετο.* We have our first information of a Theudas known to him as having appeared under Claudius and Fadus, in the passage of his Archaeology, already cited, L. 20, c. 5, § 1; a work, it is well known, which he wrote later than the history of the Jewish war, which he did not complete in fact earlier than the thirteenth year of the emperor Domitian, i. e. in the year 94 of our era.[2] This circumstance gives us reason to conjecture that perhaps Josephus at the time when he wrote his history of the Jewish war, knew nothing as yet of this Theudas, and possibly as long as he lived at Jerusalem had never heard of any such person, but obtained his first knowledge of him, at a later period, at Rome or somewhere else. In this case certainly, it is possible that, from want of correct information in regard to the time of this insurrection and some of its attendant circumstances, he may

[1] Jos. Vita, c. 1.

[2] Jos. Arch. L. 20, c. 11, § 2.

have placed the occurrence of it in the reign of Claudius, instead of assigning it to that of Augustus where it belonged.

But still it remains more probable that Josephus has not erred in his designation of the time; and it is but the more reasonable that we should abstain from imputing to him so great an error, if we can adopt any view which will remove the occasion for it. It is very possible that Josephus in his history of the Jewish war passed over the Theudas mentioned by him afterwards, not because he had then never heard of him but because at the moment when he wrote the account of Cuspius Fadus, he did not happen to think of Theudas. And supposing that Josephus first learned the history of the younger Theudas from Romans or Jews after the destruction of Jerusalem, it is but right to assume that in this instance also he knew how to estimate his authorities, and had an important reason why he supplied in the Archaeology the previous omission of this event, and now placed it in the time of the proconsul Fadus, which in his earlier work he had represented as peaceful. In general, the similarity between the two Theudases, as we shall see more fully as we proceed, is not of such a kind as to afford any special occasion for banishing one of them from history.

§ 4.

Under these circumstances since the narration of Luke bears on itself such evident and certain marks of credibility, and since probably Josephus also did not err, we think that the view that Gamaliel's Theudas is an entirely different person from the Theudas mentioned in Josephus, deserves in every respect the preference. This view we find in Beza[1] and Casaubon.[2] This view is adopted also by Grotius in his celebrated Commentary, is defended by Basnage,[3] and acknowledged as the correct one by Bengel,[4] Heumann, Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, Olshausen and others.[5] Even the Jewish writer, Jost, in his favorably known History of the Israelites, accedes to this opinion and admits the credibility of Luke as well as that of Josephus. All the

[1] Annot. maj. ad N. T., Acts 5: 36.
[2] Exerc. ad Baron. Annal. 2, 18.
[3] Histoire des Juifs, L. 7, c. 12, § 7.
[4] Theil. 2; Anhang, S. 76 and 77.
[5] Among these may be mentioned Origen, c. Celsum 1, 6; Lardner in his Credibility; Heinrichs, Acta Apost. ad. loc. and Excurs.; Guerike, Beitr. zur Einl ins N. T., S. 90 sq.; and Anger de temporum in Act. Apost. ratione, p. 185. Winer also, himself a rationalist, admits freely that Luke may be supposed without any improbability to have referred to an earlier Theudas, and that the silence of Josephus who does not record everything, affords no valid argument against it. See his Realwörterbuch, art. *Theudas*.—Tr.

difficulties which embarrass the other opinions, disappear on this supposition, while it labors under no serious objection peculiar to itself.

Two different persons, therefore, with the same name, according to this conclusion, exist in the history before us. The one lived in the days of the emperor Augustus, and appeared most probably, as has been remarked already, in the turbulent year of the death of the first Herod; the other arose under the emperor Claudius in the time of the procurator Fadus, about fifty years later than the former. The one appears at the head of about four hundred men; the other leads away a great multitude with him; and since they took even their movable effects with them, it would appear that entire families followed him. The one, finally, had more the appearance of an ambitious and bold adventurer, who at the head of his lawless followers attempts to execute his projects by violence; the other presents himself to us more as a common impostor who pretends to be a prophet and worker of miracles, and by lying promises seeks to entice a company of simple-minded people to the Jordan, in order there probably, with his comrades, to plunder them the more successfully in so secluded a region.

These two leaders have indeed the same name, and both were in the end put to death, as appears from the speech of Gamaliel and from the narrative of Josephus. But these circumstances afford no reason whatever for converting into one two persons between whose death there was an interval of half a century, and who differed from each other also in other respects.[1]

As regards the identity of the name, history presents to us elsewhere a multitude of similar examples; and especially in the Jewish history, such exist besides the one now in question. Thus among the Jews during the period from the death of the first Herod to the destruction of Jerusalem, three Judases distinguish themselves as the heads of political parties. The first is Judas, the son of Ezekias, a factious leader in the year of Herod's death; Jos. de Bel. Jud. L. 2, c. 4, § 1; Arch. L. 17, c. 10, § 5. The second is Judas the Galilean, who arose after the dethronement of Archelaus, and who is mentioned

[1] Meyer in his recent *Kritisch exegetisches Handbuch über die Apostelgeschichte*, adheres, on the whole, to the sceptical view maintained by de Wette, but adduces no stronger reason for it than that it does not seem to him probable, that two impostors among the Jews should have borne the same name, Theudas. It is this objection, which is merely an old one re-asserted, that our author proceeds now to consider, and which he shows clearly to be without foundation. To Meyer's assertion that Theudas was an uncommon name, we might oppose Winer's testimony that the name was *not* uncommon; but the facts which the writer has here spread before us, enable us to form our own opinion on this question.—Tr.

by Gamaliel along with Theudas. The third is Judas, the son of Jairus, the commander of an army of three thousand men at the end of the Jewish war; Jos. de Bel. Jud. L. 7, c. 6, § 5. During the same period five men named Simon appear among the Jews, who in like manner were instigators of sedition. These were, first, Simon, a slave of Herod in the year in which this king died; Jos. de Bel. Jud. L. 2, c. 4, § 2; Arch. L. 17, c. 10, § 6; Tacit. Hist. L. 5, c. 9; second, Simon, the son of Judas the Galilean, in the time of the emperor Claudius and the procurator Tiberius Alexander; Jos. Arch. L. 20, c. 5, § 2; third, Simon, the son of Kathla, one of the principal leaders of the Idumeans during the siege of Jerusalem; Jos. de Bel. Jud. L. 5, c. 6, § 1; fourth, Simon, the son of Arinus, a commander of the Zealots; Jos. de Bel. Jud. ibid.; fifth, Simon, the son of Gioras, well-known as the chief commander of the Jews in the time of the fearful war waged by them with the Romans; Jos. de Bel. Jud. L. 2, c. 19, § 2; L. 4, c. 9, § 3—8; L. 5, c. 1, § 3, etc.; Tacit. Hist. L. 5, c. 12. Again, during the still shorter period between the death of king Agrippa the first and the destruction of Jerusalem, several Eleazers appear among the insubordinate Jews, of whom we will notice only four who played an important political part. First, we have Eleazer, the son of Dinaeus, who disturbed the country before the outbreak of the Jewish war, and is called ἀρχιλῃστὴς; Jos. de Bel. Jud. L. 2, c. 12, § 4; L. 2, c. 13, § 2; Arch. L. 20, c. 6, § 1; L. 20, c. 8, § 5; then, Eleazer, the son of Ananias, who was active in exciting the people against the Romans; Jos. de Bel. Jud. L. 2, c. 17, § 2—9; L. 2, c. 20, § 4; further, Eleazer, a very noted leader of the Zealots in the time of the Jewish war; Jos. de Bel. Jud. L. 2, c. 20, § 3; L. 4, c. 4, § 1; L. 5, c. 1, § 2, etc.; Tacit. Hist. L. 5, c. 12; and, finally, Eleazer a descendant of Judas the Galilean, the courageous commander of the fortress Masada; Jos. de Bel. Jud. L. 7, c. 8, § 1.

With such examples, it cannot surprise us that we have also two insurrectionists named Theudas,—one under Augustus, the other under Claudius. In addition to this, the name of Theudas, as was long ago remarked by several scholars, was not uncommon. A freed-man, it is well known, is mentioned as bearing this name, in Cicero, Ep. ad div. L. 6, ep. 10; and a physician, also, in Galenus de Compositione medicamentorum per genera, L. 6, c. 14.[1] Theudas is a Greek form of the Syriac name ܬܘܕܐ = Thoda, as we perceive from the Syriac Translation, Acts 5: 36, or of the Hebrew תּוֹדָה; with which name a disciple of Jesus is designated in the Talmud,[2] at least in those

[1] Tom. 13, p. 925, ed. Kühn.

[2] Gem. Babyl. Sanhedrin, c. 6, fol. 43, a.

editions in which no passages are erased. The name, also, *Θειώδας*,[1] *Θευδίων*,[2] and תודוס = *Θῶδος*,[3] are evidently only different forms of the Syriac name Thoda.

But the similar fate of the two men authorizes us as little to banish one of them from history, as the identity of their name. The lot which befel them, was that which such desperate criminals usually experienced. Their plans failed; their lives fell a sacrifice to their temerity; and those of their party who escaped death, were dispersed. We find examples precisely similar to this in the history of the Judas, Simon and Eleazer who have been mentioned above. Their hopes were frustrated, and their end was disastrous. We know in regard to those of them of whose death history gives us any account, that they died in a violent manner. Judas the Galilean perished, and Judas, the son of Jairus, was slain in a battle. Simon, the slave of Herod, fell by the hand of the enemy; Simon, the son of Judas the Galilean, died on the cross; Simon, the son of Gioras, was executed at Rome. Eleazer, the descendant of Judas the Galilean, sought death at the hands of one of his companions in misfortune. Probably also Eleazer, the son of Simon, and Eleazer, the son of Ananias, lost their lives during the siege of Jerusalem. Hence we need not wonder, especially when we consider the severe course which the Romans were accustomed to pursue towards those who rebelled against them, that in a period of fifty years, two men named Theudas, who had been guilty of this political offence, died a violent death.

§ 5.

For these reasons, therefore, the view that the Theudas or Thoda mentioned in the Acts and the one mentioned by Josephus are two different persons, appears to us to deserve the decided preference. It rests on good ground, and is encumbered with none of the difficulties which attend the opinions of those who would banish from history one of these two offenders. Michaelis, also, in his Remarks on the New Testament, Acts 5: 36, has expressed his conviction that the insurrectionist of whom Gamaliel speaks, is an entirely different person from the one whom Josephus mentions. He considers it, however, improbable that two men should have borne the same name, and conjectures that in the case of one of them, either Luke, or, as he is inclined to believe, more probably Josephus, has given the name incorrectly. But with the examples before us which have been adduced

[1] Diogen. Laert. L. 9, c. 12, § 7. [2] Jos. Arch. L. 17, c. 4, § 2; L. 20, c. 1, § 2.
[3] Gem. Babyl. Pesachim, c. 4, fol. 53, a, b; Bezah, fol. 23, a.

in reference to Judas, Simon and Eleazer, we are not authorized, at all events not required, to make this assumption. One thing only may appear to some suspicious, and that is that Josephus does not name the elder Theudas in his historical works. But in respect to this, two cases can readily be conceived of as possible, in either of which we may acquiesce, without any solicitude for the accuracy of the sacred writer. Either Gamaliel's Theudas is included among the political disturbers whom Josephus describes, in general terms, without designating their names; or this historian refers to him since he had perhaps two names, under a different appellation.

The generally received view is the former; namely, that the elder Theudas mentioned by Gamaliel is one of those factionists whom Josephus alludes to collectively without naming them. In the year of the death of Herod, the Jewish State was disturbed by frequent attempts to instigate the people to revolt; of the authors of these attempts, Josephus speaks of only three by name. But that there were many others, who appeared at the same time, he gives us to understand in the plainest terms. He says, e. g., Arch. L. 17, c. 10, § 4: *ἐν τούτῳ δὲ καὶ ἕτερα μύρια θορύβων ἐχόμενα τὴν Ἰουδαίαν κατελάμβανη*; and § 8: *λῃστηρίων δὲ ἡ Ἰουδαία ἔμπλεως ἦν.*

He expresses himself in a similar manner in his history of the Jewish war; e. g. L. 2, c. 4, § 1 and 3. In both of his principal works,[1] a seditious incendiary appears, who excited terror in the valley of the Jordan near Amatha or Betharameton, but is referred to without name. Hence this person or some other one of this class of men, who occur in Josephus without being named, may have been the Theudas whom Gamaliel had in view. Josephus has also passed over other and still more important events; as, for example, the persecution of the Christians by Agrippa the First, which is related in Acts, ch. 12, and the expulsion of the Jews from Rome under Claudius, which is mentioned not only by Luke, Acts 18: 2, but also by Suetonius, Claud. c. 25. Hence it is not very surprising if he also passed over in silence the Theudas of the Acts, or at least omitted his name. Perhaps this elder Theudas who lived so long before his time, was not as to his exploits and fortunes so fully known to him as to Gamaliel who was born many years earlier. Since even the younger Theudas was left unnoticed in his History of the Jewish War, it cannot surprise us, if he neglected to notice also the elder Theudas not only in this work but in his Archaeology, or at least if he embraced him among the other insurrectionary chiefs whose name he has not recorded.

Still, readily as we admit the possibility of this, we consider it like-

[1] Arch. L. 17, c. 10, § 6; de Bel. Jud. L. 2, c. 4, § 3.

wise as very possible that the Theudas addressed by Gamaliel is one of the insurrectionists mentioned by name in Josephus;[1] particularly since this Theudas whom Gamaliel presented as a distinguished example along with Judas the Galilean, acquired without doubt a great celebrity. There are now among the insurgents who rose up in the year of Herod's death only three whom Josephus specifies by name in the passages already cited, namely, Judas the son of Ezekias, Simon the slave of Herod, and Athronges the shepherd. One of these three insurgents, therefore, may have been the Theudas of Gamaliel, since it is possible that Josephus cited him under another name.

It is well known from the history of the East, that persons there who changed their vocation and rose to a higher grade of service, often took a second name in addition to their former one. The Persian prince Arsicas, ascended the throne under the name of Artaxerxes; Plutarch Artax. c. 1. The Arabian Aeneas when he attained to the regal power, called himself Aretas; Jos. Arch. L. 16, c. 9, § 4. Zeno, the son of Polemon, when he became king of the Armenians, required that he should be called by them Artaxias; Tacit. Annal. L. 2, c. 56. Such examples of the adoption of a second name we find specially frequent among the Jews. The Hasmonean Jannaeus who succeeded his brother Aristobulus the First as king, was called also Alexander; Jos. Arch. L. 13, c. 12, § 1. Antipater, born in Idumea, the friend of the second Hyrcanus, and under him the highest office-bearer in the land was known before as Antipas; Jos. Arch. L. 14, c. 1, § 3. The two brothers, Jesus and Onias, in the time of the Syrian king Antiochus Epiphanes, when they became high priests, assumed likewise new names; the one called himself Jason, and the other Menelaus; Jos. Arch. L. 12, c. 5, § 1. The apostles of the Lord when they left the occupations of fishermen and tax-gatherers, and devoted themselves to the mission of proclaiming the gospel, came forward also in part with new names. Simon, Bar Jona, appears as Peter; Levi as Matthew; Judas, the son of James, as Thaddaeus. The Pharisee Saul also when he entered on the new career of an apostle, went forth with the name of Paul; and his friend Silas was called at the same time Silvanus. But especially remarkable in its relation to our inquiry is the example of a Jewish insurgent, who according to the testimony both of Dio Cassius[2] and of Eusebius,[3] excited, under the emperor Trajan, a fearful tumult in Cyrene. It was the eighteenth year of the reign of this emperor, or the year 115 of our era, when this outbreak occurred. According to the concurrent account of both historians, this

[1] Arch. L. 17, c. 10; de Bel. Jud. L. 2, c. 4.

[2] L. 68, c. 32, p. 1145—1146, ed Reimar.

[3] Hist. Eccles. L. 4, c. 2.

insurrection of the Jews who were defeated more than once by the Romans, was at last brought to an end by a great victory of the Roman commander Lucius, the same who became afterwards as they both likewise testify, the procurator of Judea. According to Dio Cassius who was born under Antoninus the Pious, and at a later period occupied the highest offices at Rome, and who certainly drew his account from authentic sources, the Jew who stood at the head of the insurgents in Cyrene, was named Andreas. But according to Eusebius, who as we see from the agreement of his narrative with that of Dio Cassius, likewise employed sure means of information, and who appeals expressly to heathen writers in whom he says that any one might find word for word everything which he relates, the same Jew appears as king Lucuas. Manifestly, the insurgent Andreas in Dio Cassius is one and the same person with king Lucuas in Eusebius. The one historian introduces him under this name and the other under that. A similar case may exist in regard to the Theudas mentioned by Gamaliel. Two of the leaders designated by name in Josephus in the passages already cited, Simon and Athronges, declared themselves as kings; and in the case of Judas, Josephus intimates that he too affected the royal dignity. Hence it is very possible that one of these three men is Gamaliel's Theudas, inasmuch as when he placed the crown on his head, he may have assumed a second name, and so occur in Josephus under a different designation from that in the Acts of the Apostles.

§ 6.

Whichever of the two cases now we may be disposed to adopt, whether we consider the Theudas mentioned by Gamaliel as one of the insurrectionists alluded to by Josephus without name, or as identical with one of the three whose career he specially describes, the result remains the same as to the credibility of Luke; we have no cause whatever to doubt the accuracy of his statements. If however we regard the second case as possible, then, finally, the question arises which of the three men whom Josephus designates by name, may with most probability be identified with the individual intended here in the Acts.

The well-known chronologist of the seventeenth century, Archbishop Usher, advances the opinion in his Annals, on the year 4001, that the Theudas mentioned by Gamaliel is to be considered as one and the same person with the Judas named by Josephus, who was the son of Ezekias. This view he rests on the supposition that the name Judas is the same as Thaddaeus or Theudas. But the supposition thus made

is not proved. Even the identity indeed of the names Thaddaeus and Theudas is doubtful, since the Syriac translator employs for Thaddaeus the word ܬܕܝ = *Thadai*, and for Theudas the word ܬܐܘܕܐ = *Thoda*, and, therefore, distinguishes the two names from each other. Still less may the name Judas, יְהוּדָה, for which the Syrian employs always ܝܗܘܕܐ = *Jihudo*, be considered as equivalent to Theudas or Thaddaeus. The apostle Judas or Jude, the son of James, it is well known, bore indeed at the same time the name Thaddaeus, but not because the two appellations were held to be identical, but in consequence of the Jewish custom already mentioned of assuming sometimes a second name. And though the two names יְהוּדָה and תּוֹדָה be derived from the same root יָדָה (Hiph. הוֹדָה), their equivalence by no means follows from this; for as two different words in general may spring from the same root, so also may two different names.

We may advance then a step further in our investigation. If the Theudas of whom Gamaliel speaks be one of the three disturbers whose names are given in Josephus, we must pronounce it most probable that the one of this number who has most claim to be considered as the individual in question is Simon, the slave of Herod. The circumstances of his history agree with this supposition more fully than those of the other two men; and it is on this ground that we rest the opinion now expressed.

First; Among those who disturbed the public peace in the year of the death of the first Herod, this Simon appears as the one who excited the greatest attention and rendered himself most notorious. He possessed peculiar advantages for the performance of the part which he undertook. Large in person, distinguished by strength of body as well as courage, he caused himself to be proclaimed as king, and adorned his head with the diadem. From Perea where he principally kept himself, he crossed the Jordan into Judea, and plundered and burnt rich castles and country-seats of the wealthier people. Even in Jericho, only some fifteen or twenty miles from Jerusalem, he caused the royal palace to be pillaged and then set on fire. His terrible fame soon spread itself on every side to an extent beyond that of all the other insurgents of that period. His name became known among the Romans, and he is the only one among those whose seditions so signalized the last year of Herod's reign, whom Tacitus, Hist. 5, 9, took occasion to notice. Post mortem Herodis, says Tacitus, nihil expectato Caesare, Simo quidam regium nomen invaserat. Hence this Simon furnishes Gamaliel with an apposite illustration of his point, when in addition to that of the noted

Judas the Galilean, he wished to present still another striking example of an impostor who had perished together with his plans.

Second; Simon is described by Josephus as a very ambitious man, or as one who entertained a high conceit of himself. It is true, the other two insurgents also, Judas and Athronges, appear as men whose object was to gain distinction and power, and the latter was likewise accustomed among his followers to wear the insignia of royalty. But Simon, according to the representation of Josephus, was distinguished in a special manner by an extravagant sense of his own merit, inasmuch as the historian says of him expressly, that he thought no one so worthy of the supreme rule as himself. Josephus uses in reference to him the words—*εἶναι ἄξιος ἐλπίσας παρ' ὀντινοῦν*; Jos. Arch. L. 17, c. 10, § 6. These words agree in a remarkable manner with that which Gamaliel said of Theudas—*λέγων εἶναι τινα ἑαυτόν.*

Third; We read in Josephus that Simon died a violent death. Of Judas, the son of Simon, and of Athronges he does not inform us that they were put to death. Perhaps in the end when they saw that all was lost, they withdrew into concealment, so that it was not known what became of them. But Josephus informs us concerning Simon in two passages, that after his company had been entirely defeated in a battle, he was put to death in his flight by the royal commander Gratus. We read in his Archaeology, L. 17, c. 10, § 6: *καὶ αὐτοῦ Σίμωνος φυγῇ διά τινος φάραγγος σώζοντος αὐτὸν, Γράτος ἐντυχὼν τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτέμνει.* This is also related in the History of the Jewish War, L. 2, c. 4, § 2. In this way the narrative of Josephus coincides with Gamaliel's expression—*ἀνῃρέθη.*

Fourth; The number of adherents assigned to Theudas by Gamaliel accords well with that which Josephus relates in reference to Simon. Gamaliel speaks of about four hundred men—*ἀνδρῶν ὡσεὶ τετρακοσίων*—who had attached themselves to Theudas. Even if on account of the indefinite expression *ὡσεί*, we go up somewhat beyond four hundred or as high as five hundred, the number then would not be very great. In the case also of Simon, we cannot infer the existence of a much greater number, according to the narrative of Josephus.[1] While the army of Athronges, which consisted of four divisions commanded by his brothers, is expressly spoken of by the Jewish historian as a great multitude, and while also the retinue of Judas is termed by the same writer not a small number—*πλῆθος οὐκ ὀλίγον*—as the language is;[2] on the contrary, the company of Simon is described differently as may be seen from the words in the Archaeolo-

[1] Arch. L. 17, c. 10, § 17—*μεγάλη πληθύς.* [2] De Bel. Jud. L. 2, c. 4, § 1.

gy, L. 17, c. 10, § 6: καὶ τινος πλήθους συστάντος, i. e. not a great but a certain multitude or a certain band. It will be noticed that Josephus does not specify numerically in either instance how many men joined these leaders in their attempts at revolt; but since he does not hesitate to designate the followers of Athronges as very numerous, and also those of Judas as not few, while he omits the use of any such epithet in relation to Simon's party, the presumption is that Josephus regarded this last as much smaller than the others. If any one should doubt whether Simon with four or five hundred men could have executed the bold feats related of him, this doubt will entirely disappear when we consider the situation in which the country of the Jews was, just at that time. Immediately after the death of the first Herod, the flames of discord burst forth at once in all parts of the land. Of the royal troops whose business it was to restore order and peace, the greatest part passed over to the side of the different insurgents and made common cause with them. Sabinus under whose command was placed the only Roman legion at that time in Palestine, had taken a strong position at Jerusalem; but he himself was in so straitened a condition that he could with difficulty hold out much longer against the rebels, and did not venture even to leave Jerusalem. Finally, Quintilius Varus who was stationed with two other legions in Syria, could not appear immediately in Palestine with these and the auxiliary troops which he had raised from the allied kings, tetrarchs and cities. Under these circumstances which existed at the commencement of this very distracted period, it was possible certainly for so daring a man as Simon with four or five hundred followers of a similar spirit to cross over the Jordan from Perea, destroy the royal citadel in Jericho and other castles, spread fear and consternation in his track, and procure for himself a fame which extended to the Romans, and of which we have still an evidence in Tacitus.

But finally; The circumstance that Simon was a slave speaks strongly for the conjecture that after he had caused himself to be proclaimed as king, he assumed another name instead of his original one. The name which he had borne as a slave, did not comport with his position after he had put on the crown. The proud spirit which he possessed, as Josephus has described him, would lead him to conceal as much as possible the low origin from which he had sprung, and hence to exchange a name which would have served only to perpetuate that remembrance, for some other in which he could appear to the world without any derogation from his new dignity as king. Hence it is in the highest degree probable, that Simon had two names, in conformity with the Jewish custom mentioned above, according to

which individuals on changing their occupation, or passing from a lower to a higher sphere of life, called themselves by a new name. Theudas, therefore, may have been the name which he had borne as a slave while he stood in that relation to Herod, and Simon the one which he adopted when he set himself up as king. The circumstance that a Simon, as is well known, was the first of the Hasmonean family, who bore the princely title, may have had something to do with his choice of this name. Should this conjecture be correct, it becomes then easy to explain why Gamaliel and Josephus have referred to him under different appellations. Gamaliel ascribed to him the name which he had borne for so long a time as a slave at Jerusalem and under which he was known to the members of the Sanhedrim; he called him Theudas because there was no reason for mentioning him under the name Simon, which he had borne a short time in his assumed capacity as king. But Josephus who wrote his historical works for Romans and Greeks, introduced him under the name, under which he once set himself up as king, burnt palaces and castles, and made himself, as we see from Tacitus, extensively renowned. As in the time of the emperor Trajan we have a remarkable example of a seditionist who occurs under two different names, since, as was remarked above, he appears in Dio Cassius as Andreas and in Eusebius as king Lucuas, so we have perhaps a similar example in the time of the emperor Augustus.

It is evident from all that has now been said, that in no case can any well founded objection be urged against the accuracy of Gamaliel's speech as reported to us by Luke. If we are not disposed to admit that Josephus committed an oversight in having ascribed incorrectly the name of Theudas to an impostor who appeared under Claudius and Fadus, but consider it more probable that he too has stated the truth in this matter, we have then two Thodases or Theudases,—the one a bold insurrectionist in the time of the emperor Augustus, the other a crafty impostor in the days of the emperor Claudius. We are at liberty, therefore, to adopt either of two conclusions; —we may consider the Theudas mentioned in the Acts as one of the political disturbers mentioned in Josephus under another name, in which case he would be most probably the same person as Simon, the slave of Herod, or as one of those factious men so numerous in that period, whom Josephus, who also passes over other important events, has not expressly mentioned in his works. At all events, we are entitled to hold fast here the consoling assurance that so far as relates to the passage on which we have been remarking, we have no ground whatever to reject the credibility of Luke; on the contrary, he who

wrote the book of the Acts, and as the confidential friend and fellow-traveller of the apostle Paul enjoyed such means for collecting the necessary facts, stands before us with claims to our confidence which still remain, and must ever remain, unimpaired.

ARTICLE III.

REMARKS ON A PASSAGE IN PLATO'S GORGIAS, p. 497. A. ed. Steph.

By T. D. Woolsey, Yale College.

Callicles. Οὐκ οἶδ' ἅττα σοφίζει, ὦ Σώκρατες. *Socrates.* Οἶσθα, ἀλλὰ ἀκκίζει, ὦ Καλλίκλεις. καὶ πρόϊθί γε ἔτι εἰς τοὔμπροσθεν, ὅτι ἔχων ληρεῖς, ἵνα εἰδῇς ὡς σοφὸς ὢν με νουθετεῖς. οὐχ ἅμα διψῶν τε ἕκαστος πεπαυται καὶ ἅμα ἡδόμενος διὰ τοῦ πίνειν.

These words are intelligible enough in themselves, and there is no uncertainty respecting the text, so far as it depends on manuscript authority. There is however a difficulty in the clause ὅτι ἔχων ληρεῖς, which all the commentators seem to feel. Cornarius proposed to read ὅ τι ἔχων ληρεῖς, probably on account of the harshness of the parenthesis with ὅτι in this place. Coray conjectured ὅτι ἑκὼν ληρεῖς. Heindorf's nice tact led him to go deeper into the difficulty, and he expresses himself as follows: "Verbis his ὅτι ἔχων ληρεῖς quid faciam non video. Calliclem haec sane decerent: (conf. § 100.[1]) Socratem, leniter ubique et argumentorum vi, non verborum asperitate adversarii nugas convincentem meo quidem judicio parum decent. Tum prorsus pervertunt ironiam in verbis quae statim post inferuntur, ἵνα εἰδῇς ὡς σοφὸς ὢν με νουθετεῖς; atque, ut sunt h. l. interposita sensu propemodum omni carent.—Nunc nulla mihi relinquitur dubitatio quin alieno loco a librario intrusa sint, in proximis fortasse Callicli sic tribuenda; οὐκ οἶδα ὅτι ἔχων ληρεῖς."

In the appendix to Heindorf's Select Dialogues of Plato (second ed. Berl. 1829), Buttmann acknowledges in part the force of Heindorf's objections, but endeavors to weaken it by the following considerations: "ut aliquo modo vulgatam lectionem tuear, per parenthesin quandam inserta haec accipio, quae sic quoque, et magis sane pro more suo ef-

[1] He refers to p. 490, D. E.

ferre potuerit Plato: *ληρεῖς γὰρ ἔχων*. Illa autem, quae est in verbis *ὡς σοφὸς ὤν με νουθετεῖς* ironia, mihi quidem non ita lenis videtur, ut eam graviore hac reprehendendi formula perverti putem." Of Heindorf's argument, drawn from the inconsistency of these words with the character of the Platonic Socrates, he says nothing,—perhaps because he felt that it could not be controverted.

Stallbaum in his first Gotha edition (1828) and Ast (Vol. XI. of his Plato, p. 331), adopt the views of Heindorf and include the words in question between brackets. On Buttmann's words, which were just now cited, the former justly observes: Buttmanno tamen omnia sana videntur; nam *ὅτι ἔχων ληρεῖς* per parenthesin esse insertum, ita ut more usitatiore dici etiam potuerit: *ληρεῖς γὰρ ἔχων*. Quae ratio haud scio an cuiquam satisfaciat: mihi quidem displicet mirifice." Probably Buttmann meant no more than to make the best defence of words, which he felt to be doubtful.

In his second Gotha edition (1840) Stallbaum has deserted his original ground to adopt a remedy for the difficulty suggested by Winckelmann in a note on Euthydemus, 295, C. (Leipzig, 1832). This is a passage where the sophist expresses himself concerning Socrates in language like that which we are considering: *οὐκ ἀποκρίνει, ἔφη, πρὸς ἃ ἂν ἀεὶ ὑπολαμβάνῃς, ὅτι ἔχων φλυαρεῖς καὶ ἀρχαιότερος εἶ τοῦ δέοντος*. Winckelmann—after remarking that in Gorgias, 490, E. we should point *ποῖα ὑποδήματα; φλυαρεῖς ἔχων*, instead of making of the four words one interrogative sentence,—goes on to suggest, that the difficulties in the present passage may be removed by assigning the words *καὶ πρόϊθί γε . . . νουθετεῖς* to Callicles and making Socrates resume his discourse at *οὐχ ἅμα*. Of the sentence beginning at *καὶ* he says: "*καὶ* in adhortando dici hodie satis constat. V. Matth. p. 1258." Stallbaum in embracing this conjecture says: "quo uno errore" (the error of assigning all the words from *Οἶσθα* to *πίνειν* to Socrates) dici non potest quam multi alii quamque graves errores prognati sint. De quibus quidem nunc, vero reperto, narrare non attinet. Debetur autem laus omnis hujus inventi Winckelmanno," etc.

Now we think it may be shown that Stallbaum has been led by his guide into an error which he would have avoided by trusting himself to his own soundness of judgment, and familiarity with Plato.

For, in the first place, the words *ὡς σοφὸς ὤν με νουθετεῖς* have no meaning in the mouth of Callicles. Socrates had nowhere been performing this office, but rather sought to lead Callicles by a series of questioning after his usual manner to do it for himself. And,—what is perfectly decisive in the matter,—Socrates had already used the same word in speaking of the discourse of Callicles, p. 488, A: *σὺ*

οὖν, ὥσπερ ἤρξω νουθετεῖν με, μὴ ἀποστῇς ἀλλ' ἱκανῶς μοι ἔνδειξαι τί ἐστι τοῦτο ὃ ἐπιτηδευτέον μοι. The speech of Callicles containing this *νουθέτησις* extends from 482, C. to 486, D, and contains the germ of the remainder of the dialogue. The latter part of it especially, from 484, C. onwards, contains advice given in a lofty and even contemptuous tone; and is several times referred to by Socrates.

2. *καὶ πρόϊθί γε*, containing an exhortation to advance in the argument is unsuited to Callicles, who wishes all the while, and especially here, to close it. It will not do to say that Callicles utters these words maliciously, hoping to involve Socrates in absurdities; for two lines before he sees the conclusion coming down on himself and tries to escape from it by the words *οὐκ οἶδα ὅ τι σοφίρει;* and his next words, *οὐκ οἶδα ὅ τι λέγεις*, so far from helping Socrates forward are a positive refusal to answer.

3. By the division of the words between the speakers, which Winckelmann proposes, an abruptness of transition is introduced which appears to us wholly unauthorized. Give *καὶ πρόϊθι* to Socrates, and it naturally leads on to what he had just said. The use of *καὶ* then will resemble that in many other places where the sentence is earnest, and either of the interrogative or imperative kind. But give these words to Callicles—a new speaker, and we think that it will be hard to defend *καὶ* by parallel places or by a logical explanation.

And so *ἅμα καὶ* comes in without giving the slightest notice that a new speaker begins. This might be allowed, if the preceding words of themselves indicated such altering. But they tell so little about it, that Socrates if he begins at *οὐχ ἅμα* pays not the least respect to the words which had been just spoken by his antagonist.

We conclude then that the new way of marking the dialogue here is altogether inadmissible. And on the other hand we are far from thinking that we can remove the difficulty in *ὅτι ἔχων ληρεῖς*, which has troubled so many persons. They look wholly unlike a gloss, containing, as they do, a very choice and idiomatic expression. They are not entirely suited to the person of Socrates. Heindorf's conjecture that they were thrust out of their place in the text by *ὅ τι λέγεις* in the sentence *οὐκ οἶδα ὅ τι λέγεις*, and that then they crept back from the margin into a wrong place may be entitled to some favor. And yet it supposes two processes, for neither of which there is diplomatic evidence. Since then they form a part of the text and are spoken of by Socrates, we must look around to find some apology for his uttering words so little in accordance with his character. That apology can be found only in the fact that he is merely hurling back the words of a provoking adversary. Callicles had used similar expressions

several times in speaking of the pursuits of Socrates. In p. 486, C. he says: *ἄλλοις τὰ κομψὰ ταῦτ' ἀφείς, εἴτε λῆρήματα χρὴ φάναι εἶναι εἴτε φλυαρίας.* In 489, B. he says: *οὗτοσὶ ἀνὴρ οὐ παύσεται φλυαρῶν.* And again in 490, E. occurs the passage which has already been cited: *ποῖα ὑποδήματα φλυαρεῖς ἔχων.* Now after three such passages and many others, filled with insults, it might be more in keeping than on any other occasion with the character of Socrates to retort the words in allusion to those of his adversary. And Plato might write thus with more than usual reason in the Gorgias, because this dialogue is marked by unusual earnestness and by an irony which sometimes runs into sarcasm and severity. If then the text is sound, which certainly for the reason given by Heindorf must be with reason questioned, we believe that the above is the only possible defence of these words. In conclusion we remark that *σοφὸς ὤν* playfully carries the mind back to *σοφίζει* occurring three lines before.

ARTICLE IV.

HÄVERNICK'S INTRODUCTORY REMARKS TO HIS COMMENTARY ON EZEKIEL.

Translated from the German by Edward Robie, Resident Licentiate, Theol. Seminary, Andover.

[H. A. Ch. Hävernick, late ordinary professor of theology in the university at Königsberg, was born in 1799 at Cröpelin in Mecklenburg. He studied some time at Halle and became the pupil and intimate friend of Prof. Tholuck. He then went to Rostock as a *privat docent* and licentiate, and thence as Professor to the New Theological School at Geneva. Here, however, he remained but a short time. From Rostock, where he had returned as professor extraordinarius, he was called by the government of Prussia to the university of Königsberg. Here, it is well known, he encountered a violent opposition from the rationalist party long predominant there. His health sank under it, and, it is said, that he died of a broken heart. He was a man of indefatigable industry and of great learning, and all his works breathe the spirit of fervent love to the truth as it is in Jesus. Some of his earlier productions betrayed marks of haste and inaccuracy. This charge has not been laid, so far as we know, against his more

mature works. His Introduction to the Old Testament, published 1836—1844, in four volumes, is in many respects a very able and satisfactory performance, though the neological critics assail it of course. It fearlessly and with great learning vindicates the Divine Word against the assaults which have been made upon it. The Commentary on Ezekiel is the last work which appeared from his pen. Prof. Tholuck remarked to the writer of these lines, that, in his judgment it was the best Commentary on that prophet which has ever appeared. Hitzig's Commentary was published in 1847. See p. 391. The following translation includes the author's general preliminary observations.—E.]

§ 1. *Circumstances of the Life of Ezekiel.*

It is an opinion as unfounded as it is prevalent, that we have but scanty means of information respecting the lives of most of the prophets, and are thereby unable to form a well-defined picture of their prophetic activity. The error lies in the wrong point of view from which information of that kind has been sought for, which, if obtained, would be of little service towards enabling us to understand the peculiar work in which they were engaged as prophets. When their prophetic calling brought them into connection with the State, and thereby made their outward life sûbject to many changes, we are told of it, as in the case of the earlier prophets, especially in the kingdom of Israel, and also of the later prophets as Jeremiah. But when their labors were more properly spiritual, consisting chiefly in the preaching of the word, then the record of their words is in fact the description of their activity, and their prophetic biography. The latter is the case with Ezekiel. While we have but few data respecting his outward life, we have the more abundant information respecting his inner life, his divine commission as a prophet and the peculiarity of his activity in this relation.

In the year 599 B. C. Jehoiachin, king of Judah, after a reign of three months was obliged to submit to the king of the Chaldeans and was led into captivity together with the principal Jews. The same lot befell Ezekiel, the son of Buzi. He belonged to a distinguished sacerdotal family and was therefore particularly liable to the calamities of captivity, cf. 2 Kings 24: 14. It is evident also from chap. xi. that the prophet was intimately connected with the principal priesthood. It is often assumed that he left his native land while yet young, but this is not probable. The mature, comprehensive and sacerdotal spirit which prevails in his prophecies (connected with the fact that

the word of the Lord came to him in the fifth year of the captivity of Jehoiachin) renders it probable that it was not at an early age that he left his home. Undoubtedly he had served as a priest in the temple, of the plundering of which by Nebuchadnezzar he was witness, 2 Kings 24, 13. He betrays a thorough knowledge of the ancient sanctuary in all its individual parts, which therefore had been deeply impressed upon his memory. What we have supposed of his age when led into captivity compares well with what is said of the time he spent in exile, which was twenty-seven years (cf. 1: 1 with 29: 17), and we have no account of his having survived this period.

Ezekiel was led into the northern part of Mesopotamia to Tel-abib on the banks of the river Chebar. His family also was with him, 3: 24. 8: 1. 24: 18. The place was remarkable by the meeting there of the earlier exiles from the kingdom of the ten tribes with the later exiles who were companions of Ezekiel. It was therefore peculiarly fitted to be the scene of the labors of the prophet. But not till the fifth year of his banishment was Ezekiel called by God to the prophetic office. The embassy that Zedekiah sent at this time to Babylon and the letter of Jeremiah carried by that embassy to the captives, Jer. 29: 1–3, may be regarded as connected with the divine call given to Ezekiel. In a wonderful vision he receives the commission to appear as a prophet to the children of Israel and is told what to say to them, that they may know that a prophet is in the midst of them, 2: 5.

The work of the prophet as represented in his book is a well-completed, harmonious whole. It is divided into two sections, the turning point of which is the destruction of Jerusalem, chap. i—xxxii. and xxxiii—xlviii. (The first section embraces a period of seven years, the second of sixteen years.) In the first, he speaks the language of rebuke and condemnation, in the second of consolation and promise.

The prophet as a true watchman of Israel, appointed by God, had in view not merely the small circle immediately surrounding him, but the entire Theocracy. His attention, therefore, is chiefly directed to Jerusalem which remained proud and secure in her sins, and hastening recklessly to destruction. In the first period of his labors, it is his leading purpose clearly to set forth the primitive judgments which were coming upon the devoted city, and to point out all the causes which were hastening their coming. God's decree is as unalterable as it is just. This thought pervades his discourse—a continual cry of woe—a word of energy and power, already sounding forth the thunders of the approaching judgment.

Such was the relation of the prophet to the Jewish people generally. He had also a more immediate relation to the exiles among whom he

lived. His announcement of the judgment which awaited the whole nation was to them a more powerful warning to repentance, inasmuch as the judgment had in part already fallen upon them. Even here it was necessary to cast down the foolish and carnal hopes of those, to whom it seemed impossible that Jerusalem should be destroyed, and the sanctuary become a ruin. But, in order to prevent the feeling of despair which might arise in the bosoms of some because of the misery around them and their distance from the land of their fathers, the prophet even in the midst of threatenings gives glimpses of the Divine mercy, 11: 16. Moreover, there were those in Babylon who loved their idolatrous pursuits, and had no sense for the ways and works of God, and scorned his justice; to them the word of the prophet came, earnestly rebuking them for their hardness of heart and warning them to turn unto God. The central point of his activity is the idea of *judgment*, and from this his anxious care goes out over all the people. But while embracing the entire nation in his view, he also has a tender regard for the circumstances and relations of the individuals who are with him, so that we have not anywhere a more graphic picture of the condition of the exiles than that given by Ezekiel.

But Ezekiel does not regard the condition of the Theocracy alone, he also takes into view their relation to the Gentile world. When, for a long time, he had preached repentance unto Israel, he directs his attention to the Gentiles, chap. xxv—xxxii. He will have it known by the proud and haughty nations who are now triumphing over his suffering country, that their power is certainly failing, and that the Theocracy is ripening for an eternal victory over the world.

The great catastrophe, the turning point of the prophecy, has taken place. Jerusalem has been destroyed, and the sanctuary lies in ashes. The word of the Lord has been fulfilled, and the people quake and tremble at the awfulness of the fulfilment. But a new spiritual period begins to dawn upon them, and the prophet now speaks to them in the language of encouragement and promise. He directs their view beyond the present with its oppressive sorrows to a future rich in its blessings. The eye of faith should be immovably fixed upon the inexhaustible fulness of Divine mercy. In this faith, Israel should be strong in their God, patient in tribulation and joyful in hope. And as before the prophet had uncovered and brought to light the mass of corruption in the people, and the merited punishments which were near at hand, so now he describes in rich and exalted imagery the development of the coming salvation.

The influence, which the prophet exerted upon his contemporaries, was uncommonly important. As in the days of Elijah and Elisha,

the prophets in the kingdom of Israel supplied the want of a sanctuary, and took the place of an anointed priesthood, so the priest Ezekiel, by his prophetic office, gave testimony to the deserted exiles that God was not departed from them, and that a sanctuary still remained for them, in which they might trace the gracious presence of God. His influence was the more powerful because of their sad condition. There is evidence of this in those accounts, according to which the people and their elders frequently assembled around the prophet and listened to his words, 8: 1. 11: 25. 14: 1. 20: 1. 33: 31, 32. In the words of God to the prophet, it is implied that the people were accustomed at appointed times to come to Ezekiel, to sit before him, and to receive his instructions with reverence. He was considered as a public teacher, who appointed meetings at his house as in a public school, and there before a crowded assembly interpreted the Divine will. Nor was this influence transitory or confined to his own generation, but is to be regarded as extending to the formation of the entire religious character of the later Judaism. In this respect the book of Ezekiel is analogous to that of Daniel. When we see evidences of a remarkable change among the exiles in their relation to the law, when we observe the colony which returned home conforming to the requirements of the law with a scrupulosity and constancy before unknown, an essential share in the production of this phenomenon is to be ascribed to the influential labors of such a man as Ezekiel. Without such an influence the unity of the people amid so many tendencies to dissolution, is with difficulty to be accounted for. It was undoubtedly permitted to Ezekiel, what was denied to Jeremiah, to witness the beginning of this renovation of his afflicted country.[1]

§ 2. *Personal Character of Ezekiel.*

In the prophecies of Ezekiel we discover a character of marked peculiarity. The most prominent features of this character are the following.

First of all, the prophet is distinguished by uncommon strength and energy. We see in him an individuality naturally endowed with great intellectual strength, penetrated and sanctified by a higher power to which it is made subservient. The appearance of Ezekiel as an inspired messenger of God must have been among the most impres-

[1] Ezekiel was held in special veneration by later Jews and also by the Christian Fathers. Cf. Son of Sirach 49: 8. Gregory of Nazianzus calls him *ὁ τῶν προφητῶν θαυμασιώτατος καὶ ὑψελότατος*; also, *ὁ τῶν μεγάλων ἐπόπτης καί ἐξηγήτης μυστηρίων καὶ θεαμάτων.*

sive of any of those who under the Old Testament dispensation spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. The glow of divine wrath, the holy majesty of Jehovah, the mighty rushing of the Spirit of the Lord, as the seer himself had seen and heard them, were reflected in his discourse. He opposed with abruptness and firmness the corrupt spirit of the age in which he lived. When he had to contend with a people of brazen brow and stiff neck, he also on his part is of unbending nature, opposing presumption with unwavering boldness, and denouncing abominable deeds with words of consuming fire. This glow of discourse is united with a clear and constant prudence. The prophet never passes hastily from one subject to another, he occupies himself entirely with the one before him, embraces it with all his power, views it in all its aspects, and does not rest till he has completely exhausted it. Hence, he often returns to the great leading thoughts that animate him. In these he lives and moves. Unceasingly he presents to the hardened ears and hearts of the people what the necessity of the case requires. And to this union of perseverance and strength the great efficacy of his eloquence is to be ascribed.

In the next place, Ezekiel is distinguished by his *sacerdotal* spirit. This is much stronger in him than in Jeremiah. Even as prophet he does not deny his levitical origin and disposition, for he has with all his soul served the Lord in the sanctuary. Moreover, the circumstances, in which he was placed, required him to maintain the character of a priest, not merely because a man of his family must of course enjoy a certain authority among the people, but because in him as priest a spiritual blessing was conferred upon them, a continual memento of the sanctuary of the Lord was given them, and his voice awakened their longings for those gracious manifestations of Jehovah which had been lost. Numerous evidences of this sacerdotal spirit are found in the book of Ezekiel. It appears in the manner of his calling (c. i. cf. c. x). Individual features of it are frequently seen in his attachment to the law given by Moses, 20: 12. 22: 8, 26. Some have wished to discover in this disposition of the prophet a narrowness of mind.[1] Even Ewald[2] says that "it was in consequence of a one-sided attachment to the ancient Judaism as described in books and made venerable by tradition, as well as a result of a despondency of spirit in view of the long banishment and present degradation of the people." But in opposition to this opinion we might say, that Ezekiel, from the commencement of his life as a prophet, was devotedly attached to the law, and that so far from manifesting any despondency of mind, he possessed

[1] *Gesenius* z. Jes. II. s. 205. *De Wette* Einl. 5te Aufl. s. 317.

[2] d. Proph. d. A. B. II. s. 209.

a noble courage, looking away from the sufferings of the present time, and living with constant enthusiasm in the hopes of a new formation of the kingdom of God in the future. The origin of this opinion is an unscriptural view of the law and of the relation of the prophets to the law. If one regards the ceremonial law as inculcating merely forms of worship and thereby impairing the freedom of mind, then such devotedness to the law as manifested by Ezekiel appears to be narrowness of mind. But the law in his view was not merely ceremonial. In all his fidelity and love to it, he sees spiritual ideas expressed in its ritual. The closing section beginning with c. xl, shows that his adherence to the law was not a servile dependence upon it, but that he knew its meaning both for the time of the Old Testament and that of the New, and in their agreement as well as in their difference.

This close adherence to the Pentateuch is specially interesting in a character of such marked originality as that of Ezekiel. He will stand on no other foundation than that which God has laid, and on this he will build. No self-will, no false effort to promote his own glory, are seen in him, but a true and faithful yielding up of himself to the Divine arrangement of things, an inner organic connection with the same. A like principle is manifest in the relation of Ezekiel to other prophets. In a time in which true prophecy was given but seldom (Lam. 2: 9. Ez. 12: 21 f.), and the disposition to appreciate it was visibly declining, Ezekiel appeals to the former prophets as the witnesses of the divine truth, 38: 17, and declares that his word is in unison with theirs. A proof, how qualified for his calling and how entirely consecrated to his office was that prophet, who was so completely penetrated by the organic power of the *διαδοχὴ τῶν προφητῶν*, ordained by God, the unity which embraces all possessed by the prophetic spirit! In this respect the relation of Ezekiel to Jeremiah, his elder contemporary, is specially important. As already remarked, his first appearance as a prophet was intimately connected with Jeremiah by the message which the latter sent from Jerusalem to the Jews in captivity, and many passages in his book refer to expressions of Jeremiah, 3: 14. 7: 14. c. 13. cf. Jer. 23: 9 f. Not merely in single passages, but in entire trains of thought and their application to the times, there is a remarkable similarity in the prophets, as has been frequently observed by the earlier theologians. E. g. Calvin says: neque naturaliter contigit, ut unus Hierosolymae, alter vero in Chaldea sic quasi ex uno ore proferrent sua vaticinia, ac si duo cantores alter ad alterius vocem sese componerent. Non potuit enim desiderari melior nec concinnior melodia, quam apparet in istis duobus servis Dei. The old

tradition both among Jews and Christians[1] according to which Ezekiel was the son or servant of Jeremiah, may be well explained as arising from the perception of the harmony of the two prophets, without its being necessary to suppose that any relation of that kind existed, or even that ever there was any formal agreement between them.

In Ezekiel there is perceptible no small degree of intellectual cultivation, for which his distinguished birth and his sacerdotal rank would naturally give him many advantages. Traces of his learning are seen not only in his precise knowledge of the law, but also in his knowledge of the history both of his own people and of other nations, and in his views of architecture. This has been noticed by other theologians, e. g. *Witsius*[2]—fuit sane hic noster vir eruditione et ingenio eximius, ita ut seposito etiam prophetiae dono, quod incomparabile est, cum aliis illustribus scriptoribus comparari mereatur, ob pulcherrimas *ἐννοίας*, comparationes elegantes et magnam rerum multarum, praesertim architecturae, peritiam. Ewald has presented this characteristic of Ezekiel in an extravagant manner, when he makes a distinction between "public life, an active participation in the experiences of the same, and the mere literary life of the scholar confined to the narrow limits of his home," and ascribes the latter to the prophet, but denies that the former belonged to him.

Ewald's view of Ezekiel would make him appear as a scholar who lives among his books alone. But no prophet ever lived in this way, and of Ezekiel the contrary is most certainly true. An active character like his could not possibly be confined to the limits of mere literary activity. His whole tendency is decidedly practical. How interested he was in the life and minutest relations of his contemporaries, is evident from his discourse to the exiles, c. xii. sq. His influence upon them appears from the fact that they rallied around him as their centre. It was he, who regulated their religious observances, and gave a new form to their whole life. Such results, however, would have been impossible, if the prophet had not had a most active share in public life, so far as we can speak of a public life as existing in that day, and been present among the people amid the desolations that prevailed, endeavoring to rescue what could be rescued, and, as an instrument of God, promote the design which was to be realized by the Divine punishments inflicted upon them in their captivity and exile.

With good reason, Witsius called the *donum prophetiae* in Ezekiel *incomparabile*. All his prophecies are pervaded with that certainty, which he knows to attend the Divine counsels. His views of the condition of the world as it then was show how clearly he had

[1] Carpzov. Introd. p. 194.

[2] Miscell. ss. I. p. 243.

apprehended it in its nature, how he had examined it in all its relations and was qualified to give judgment respecting it (c. xiv). No less wonderful are his glances into the future. It is true, that the prophet regards the future mostly in its general outlines, his view is directed chiefly to the kingdom of God in its widest extent. But, at the same time, there are not wanting remarkable glimpses of minute particulars in the unfolding of the future, special predictions, which, by their precise fulfilment, have received a seal of the truth and Divine illumination of the prophet. Among the prophecies directed against foreign nations, those directed against Tyre and Egypt (c. xxvi. f.) may be referred to in this connection. Among those directed to the Jews, the announcement of the fate of Zedekiah (c. 12: 12 f. and the prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem (c. xxiv, cf. xxxiii.) are specially prominent. This particularity in the description of coming events has been noticed by several modern theologians.[1] Zunz[2] supposes that such special predictions are unknown in true prophecy, and finds in them a reason for assigning a later date to the composition of the book. No more striking confession can be desired than this, of the embarrassments into which scepticism must ever fall when brought in contact with the words of prophecy. An unbelieving spirit does not find itself at home, when it comes to the criticism of so wonderful, so exalted a work as that of Ezekiel. This very work it is, which serves as a clear testimony against the narrow view of those, who, in defiance of all history, would maintain that the time of the Babylonish captivity was not an age specially distinguished by the revelations of God unto his people.

§ 3. *Style and Method of Ezekiel.*

The style and method of Ezekiel is by no means the same throughout, but is exceedingly various and changing. There is in part a pure didactic manner with quiet progress of thought. This is found mostly in c. xii—xix, inclusive. In this section he frequently connects his instructions with well-known proverbs. He also explains the words of the law with a minuteness not found elsewhere, c. xviii. The prevailing style is that of prophetic oratory. The prophet seldom rises to poetic elevation; examples, however, of genuine poetry, expressive of deep emotion, will be found in c. xix, xxvii, xxxii.

A prominent characteristic of the style of Ezekiel is a frequent use

[1] Jahn, Einl. 2, s. 589. De Wette says that "in no one of the prophets do we find so particular prophecies as in Ezekiel." Einl. s. 318.

[2] Gottesdienstl. Vortr. d. Juden, 5. 158.

of allegory and of symbols. He opens to our view a peculiar kind of imagery. He describes visions which astound by their splendor and majesty. In their form and purport they may be compared with those seen by the prophet Daniel. In the composition of these images, sometimes reality is disregarded, and not seldom the literal and the figurative are mingled together (c. xvii, xxix). The symbols are of colossal character, corresponding to the great thoughts that fill the mind of the prophet. While unfolding his visions, the prophet himself appears completely wrapped up in them and deeply affected by them. In this way, his discourse has received a dramatic form, in which the prophet faithfully describes his own feelings and thoughts in his relation to Jehovah. Hence arises the numerous variety of symbolical actions, in which the prophet sets before us in an impressive manner his own participation in the objects of his vision, and which appear in him more clearly than in the other prophets as purely mental processes.

Some have regarded the symbolical style of Ezekiel as belonging to his literary art, and would give it no higher origin than this.[1] The *author*, it is said, has swallowed up the *prophet*. The productions are purely artistic. Now, it is true, that there is a certain art employed in this method of the prophet. But it is a misunderstanding of the nature of prophecy, if one supposes that an artistic impulse was the productive principle of these compositions. Prophecy has its root in another soil than that of art; otherwise, it would, at the best, be but an imitation. The art of the author is seen in the prophet by his graphic, complete and faithful reproduction of the visions as he originally saw them. It is the historic art of narrating what he had seen, which must be ascribed to the prophet, and in which he displays a masterly skill. Improper judgments on this point respecting Ezekiel will at once be removed, if it be remembered that the prophet is not to be judged merely as an artist or poet. On the other hand, it must be admitted that this symbolical method, while it immediately introduces us into the inner world of the prophetic spirit, is at the same time mysterious, often enigmatical and obscure. The prophet prefers it, because it awakens attention, incites to examination and strikes impressively upon the heart. Jerome calls the book of Ezekiel, scripturarum oceanum et mysteriorum Dei labyrinthum. Because of its difficulties, the Jews prescribed, that no one should read it until thirty years of age.[2]

The style of the prophet considered in its general features has often

[1] De Wette, Einl. s. 318. Ewald, s. 210. cf. Hitzig, z. Jes. Einl. s. XXVIII.

[2] Hieron. praef. ad Ezechiel. Zunz, gottesdienstl. Vortr. d. Juden, s. 163.

been unjustly censured. But at length Ewald[1] has well remarked: "This prophet, regarded merely as an author, has great excellences, especially for the unhappy time in which he lived. His style has, indeed, as is the case with most of the later Jewish writers, a certain prolixity and diffuseness, often very involved sentences, rhetorical minuteness and redundancy; but it never becomes so diffuse as that of Jeremiah, the prominent subject is easily resumed and usually well concluded. The discourse is rich in singular comparisons, often both pleasing and apposite, full of variations and yet well finished. When the discourse rises to a description of the prophet's exalted visions, a genuine dramatic life is seen. Moreover, there is a certain calmness and quietness, qualities which especially distinguish it from the manner of Jeremiah."

Ezekiel frequently repeats certain forms of expression which are characteristic both of himself and of his age. Among these are, e. g. the address to the prophet, "son of man," the designation of the people as בֵּית מְרִי "rebellious house," (2: 5. 3: 9. 12: 2), the declaration "they shall know that I am the Lord," or "they shall know that a prophet is in the midst of them," (13: 9. 33: 33. 2: 5), the announcement of a vision, "The hand of the Lord was upon me," "set thy face," etc., the frequent assurance, "the word of the Lord came unto me," the solemn introduction, "as I live, saith the Lord."

With regard to the language employed by Ezekiel, we may observe, on the one hand, a dependence upon the old models, such as prevailed throughout this period. The language is strongly colored by the influence of the Pentateuch. On the other hand, the originality of Ezekiel is seen in the great number of expressions not found elsewhere, and which perhaps were first formed by the prophet. Besides, the influence of the Aramaean element and of the popular dialect is very perceptible. In this respect, Ezekiel has much that is analogous to Jeremiah and Daniel, and presents more grammatical anomalies than are to be found among the other prophets.[2]

§ 4. *Composition of the Book.*

Although there is no doubt even among modern critics, but that Ezekiel was the author of the prophecies ascribed to him, yet there has not been a uniformity of opinion respecting their collection and arrangement in one book.

Jahn[3] supposed he discovered a want of order in the arrangement

[1] Die Propheten des Alten Bundes, s. 212.

[2] Hävernick, Handbuch der Einleitung, I. 1. s. 234. [3] Einleitung, 2. s. 593.

of the predictions, as those against foreign nations are arranged together, and the chronological order is interrupted by 29: 17 and also by 26: 1, compared with 29: 1. Similar exceptions to the chronological order are found in chap. xxxv, xxxviii, xxxix. But to explain this arrangement, as Jahn does, by ascribing it to the mere "chance according to which the collector copied the several predictions in the order in which he found them in copies already existing," is altogether impossible. For in the first place, this explains nothing, since the question again arises, why in the original copy the passages referred to were in that precise order in which they were. In the next place, this assumed sway of "chance" in arranging together the parts which are similar in the nature of their subjects, is utterly fallacious. Why should the collector have adopted an arrangement regarded by Jahn as suitable, and not have followed another and more convenient plan? But Jahn has not troubled himself conscientiously to seek such a plan.

While Jahn thus with a certain coolness is satisfied with the general assumption of "chance," Eichhorn[1] endeavors to determine more definitely what this chance was. The arbitrary manner in which Eichhorn determined the time of individual predictions from their internal character is seen in his work on the Hebrew Prophets. To explain the confusion which he supposes to exist in the collocation of the prophecies, he takes refuge in the assumption that there were a number of small volumes or scrolls, from which the whole book was composed, and since the principle of economy was stronger than a regard to the proper connection of the several parts, in order to save time and parchment, two predictions belonging to very different periods were often written upon the same scroll. In the present state of criticism this once favorite mode of explanation can only be regarded as belonging to the department of curiosities. The evidence that the collector had really the purpose to put together what was of kindred nature, and regarded therefore the purport of the predictions and not such a crude and unessential circumstance, is too undeniable, and is not denied by Eichhorn, but is immediately supplanted by the new hypothesis that he united together the separate scrolls to save the trouble of transcribing!

According to Bertholdt,[2] the collector of the whole book found two old collections, chaps. xxv—xxxii. and 33: 21—xxxix.; the other predictions he found only separately, which he endeavored to arrange in chronological order. But this assumption is shown to be ground-

[1] Einleitung, IV. s. 237.

[2] Einleitung, IV. s. 1487.

less, as De Wette[1] has already remarked, by the fact that 33: 21 stands in necessary connection with 24: 27. Bertholdt says, "In this arrangement the collector naturally followed his own judgment unless at times he was directed by an old tradition where a prediction was to be placed." Had Bertholdt investigated more minutely the nature of the plan which the collector adopted, he might have discovered the reasons of that "judgment" and seen how old the "tradition" must have been. Several modern critics, as De Wette, Knobel[2] and Ewald, have very justly acknowledged that the manner in which the predictions are collected and arranged is such, that it may be regarded as coming from Ezekiel himself. For this view the following reasons are especially decisive. (a) This arrangement proceeds according to a plan corresponding to the purport of the predictions. A chronological order is united with the order of subjects in the predictions respecting foreign nations, and a strictly chronological order, denoted in the superscriptions, is seen in the prophecies respecting the people of Israel. Such a regular arrangement may be most properly traced to the author himself as employed in the publication of the whole book. (b) The predictions have an intimate relation to each other. This is true not only of those which were written in the same period, but of those which were written in different periods. Each successive section has frequent references to the preceding. If this organic connection had been observed, many hindrances to the right understanding of the book in former times would have been prevented. Ewald regards the passages, 46: 16—18 and 19—24, as "for an unknown reason out of their proper connection," but even if this opinion were better founded than it is, it forms too unimportant an exception to prove anything against the general plan of the book. (c) Finally, the manner in which Ezekiel sometimes at the close of a prediction adds a historical notice of himself (11: 24, 25), makes it probable that the prophet made such additions while collecting his predictions, since the committing to writing of the single predictions was undoubtedly previous to the publication of the whole, and no other man than the prophet could well have allowed himself to have made notices of that kind. Ewald indeed supposes that the predictions were not committed to writing till some considerable time after they were received by the prophet, and that the book was gradually formed out of several series. But for this assertion there is no sufficient proof. On the contrary, we have evidence that the prophets,[3] especially of this period, were accustomed to write their predictions immediately on re-

[1] Einleitung, s. 319. [2] Die Propheten der Hebraer, II. s. 315.
[3] Commentar zu Daniel, s. XXVIII.

ceiving them, Dan. 7: 1. Jer. xxxvi. Moreover, it appears from the particularity of the dates with which each section is provided, that the prophet had been careful to denote the day on which he had received his revelations. Finally, the peculiarity of Ezekiel in describing his visions with a minuteness of detail, representing even the smallest features, shows that the impression of the revelation which he had received and of his consequent rapture, was too lively and powerful for any considerable period to have elapsed between the time of the vision and the writing of it. Otherwise, we must assume a later artificial decoration from the mere fancy of the prophet, against which we have already protested, § 3.

ARTICLE V.

TRAVELS IN NORTHERN SYRIA. DESCRIPTION OF SELEUCIA, ANTIOCH, ALEPPO, ETC.

By Rev. William M. Thomson, American Missionary in Syria.

[In the Numbers of this work for February and May last, we published Mr. Thomson's narrative of his Tour from Beirût to Bahlulîah, where he was taken ill and obliged to abandon at that time the further prosecution of his object. Subsequently, he visited Aleppo and returned to his home on Mount Lebanon by a very interesting route, through Jeble el-Aala, Apamia, Ribla, etc. The narrative of this tour we shall insert hereafter. We now present to our readers Mr. Thomson's account of the continuation and completion of his journey to Aleppo. A few notices gathered from earlier tours are incorporated. Northern Syria is a most interesting region both to the biblical and classical scholar. Large portions of it remain unexplored, and valuable discoveries will doubtless be made as men of science shall be attracted thither. We are surprised that a field so tempting as Palestine and Syria must be to the geologist and to students in other branches of natural science, is permitted to lie so long fallow.—E.]

Aug. 6th, 1846. It was two by the clock, when, with a prayer, a blessing, and a silent adieu to loved ones asleep, I left Abeih, and by the soft, calm moonlight of a Syrian morning descended to Beirût. A boat, called the Express, I chartered forthwith, purchased

provisions, got passports, health bills, letters to friends, and of that "which answereth all things" enough for the way; and at half past three o'clock we lifted our anchor and sailed for Swadea. The wind was fair and firm, our boat was light and lively, "just as one likes it," and over the sea she flew, as a young gazelle bounds across the desert. We passed Jebeil, and we passed Batrûn, and, when the sun sank to rest, we were gazing upon the bold, bald head of Theuprosopon. The breeze freshened, and the jolly little Express responded most handsomely to its vehement urgency. Through the gray twilight, the "*Nose*" of Enfeh cut the shadowy profile of its low promontory on the dusky horizon. As the moon climbed over the summit of Lebanon, we were sailing amongst the islets of Tripoli, which lay on the heaving bosom of the deep like a flock of great gulls asleep. Arvad we found at midnight, sitting solitary upon the sea, with the weeds of her long widowhood around her. Through the battlements of Tortosa, and Paltos, and Jebilee, all ragged and rotten, the wild wind wailed a melancholy dirge over the "desolations of many generations" as we passed by in haste. And when the sun rose bright and warm, on the dark Ansairiyeh hills, we had swept round the long low Ras, Ibn Hâny, just north of Ladakîa, into the shallow bay between this and the next salient point called Ras Tasera. On both these points are ancient ruins, and near one or the other, once stood the Grecian city Heraclea. By ten o'clock we had crossed the broad bay at the termination of the great Wady Kundeel. High chalk hills, on either side of this wady, bend down to the sea, and in the winter, the wind is drawn fiercely up the valley, rendering the navigation not a little dangerous. *Now*, however, we shot across from headland to headland without fear, and by 11½ doubled the lofty Ras Bossîyeh, and ran into the bay on the north side of the "Ras," to examine the remains of the Greek Posidium. The chalk hills of Wady Kundeel, are here succeeded by dark ferruginous, and silicious rock, the southern commencement of Mt. Casius. The ruins at Ras are insignificant, and we did not delay to look at them, but ran along the base of Casius, only a few rods from the shore. The mountain springs up boldly from the sea, almost perpendicularly, to the height of 5318 feet. Near the middle, it is divided by a huge cleft, or fissure, as though the southern half, when settling into permanent repose, had *sagged* down, with a southwestern *dip*, showing a terrific precipice on the north. This is lower than the other half, and between them a narrow winding valley sinks right down to the shore, and terminates in a small cove, with a little landing place, called Minet Ksab, from an Armenian village of this name, at the head of the gorge. The scenery is

sufficiently wild, and the huts of a few Armenian peasants cling with perilous tenacity to the winding terraces which hang on the brow of this romantic fissure midway between sea and sky. There is another anchorage called Karabajack, at the north of Casius, but our captain, doubting the ability of his pet "messenger," to ride out this south-western gale in such an exposed roadstead, made for the mouth of the Orontes, intending to bound over the bar on the back of some of these great waves. In his terror and confusion, however, he mistook his whereabouts, and when too late, made desperate efforts to carry his craft out to sea again. We were nearly swamped in this fruitless attempt. She refused to answer to the helm, and would not *move* but lay wallowing in the trough of the sea, at the mercy of a tremendous ground swell. The merciless wind all the while blew madly round the north end of Casius, and the waters ran riot, swelling, bursting, and foaming in frantic commotion. The captain and sailors threw off their clothes, and ran to us for money to throw into the angry element, to propitiate St. George whose white-washed *Mazar* stood conspicuous upon the shore. Not understanding well the connection between this offering and the desired result I gave nothing; others, with greater faith, or more fear, bestowed a few paras, which were instantly cast into the sea, with loud supplications to this saint of all sects to save us. He however did not appear to exercise much control over either wind or waves. The one blew, and the other raged as madly as ever, and at length a huge billow lifted us, "nolens volens," upon its giant shoulders, and with a mighty convulsive fling which shattered itself into ten thousand frothy fragments, threw us indignantly upon the shore. —"There let him lie."—A succession of rude waves battered the groaning sides of the poor stranded Express, and quickly keeled her over on her beam ends, pitching ourselves very unceremoniously into the surf. The water on the *land side* of the vessel was not deep, and we easily succeeded in getting all our baggage safely on shore. Defeat is no disgrace in such an unequal contest with the treacherous deep, and thankful to that kind Providence which had rescued us from our somewhat critical adventure, I walked across the plain to the hospitable mansion of ex-consul general Barker at Swadea. This gentleman told me that during fifty years that he had resided in Syria, he never knew so quick a passage from Beirût. We had been exactly twenty-one hours on the water, and he jocosely remarked that we knew well how to fly, but not how to alight in safety. It was by some such summer's blast as this, I suspect, that Jonah was cast on shore; and by the way, a local tradition, assigns that adventure also to this very sandy beach, and why not, since this is the direct road,

and nearest landing point to Nineveh. The very last party of friends who have gone to Mosul, landed here on their way thither.

Aug. 8th. In company with Mr. E. Barker, I spent this day in examining the ruins of ancient Seleucia at the foot of Jeble Mûsa, N. W. of Swadea some five or six miles. In fifty minutes ride, we came to a large fountain called Neba el-Kebeer. The rock is hewn away, and rounded into a grand arch over the fountain, which pours out a generous stream of sweet cold water, sufficient to drive a mill. At this point the remains begin, and extend along the base of the hill for two miles, to the sea. The rock rises in high perpendicular precipices, forming a strong natural rampart beneath which chrystal fountains gush out in delightful abundance. The famous artificial harbor is an irregular oval basin, formerly surrounded by heavy walls with gates and towers, considerable portions of which still exist. The entrance was by an artificial channel, thirty-three paces wide, cut through a projecting termination of the mountain. There was the gate, and the shipping reached the harbor by a winding canal about half a mile long. *Outside* of the gate, there was an exterior harbor, the walls of which were carried into the sea, in the shape of a horse-shoe, the extremities overlapping each other. This outer harbor is 195 paces wide at the present water line, which the accumulated sand of ages has pushed back 115 paces from the gateway. How far the piers extended into the sea I could not determine. The stones of the south pier are twenty-two feet long, six wide, and nearly five thick, cut from the highly fossiliferous limestone of the adjacent mountain. From the extremity of this pier Ras Bossîyeh bears 200°. Highest peak of Casius 170, and of Jeble St. Simon (the younger) 112. The sand of the shore is a dark volcanic pepperite, which constitutes both the rock and the soil of much of the hills immediately north of Swadea. Both the shore, and the interior canal, are now so high above the sea, as to suggest the probability of a rise in this coast since the days when shipping sailed through the narrow gateway into the harbor. The truth of this could be tested by a few days' work in clearing away the rubbish at the gate. If the rock bottom of the gateway is above the present level of the sea, the question would be settled—and appearances decidedly indicate this. I trust some one will have time to make the examination.

The most remarkable thing at this place is the *tunnel*, made, apparently, to divert a mountain torrent from entering the harbor. Across the torrent an extremely thick wall was erected, turning the brook out of its bed *westward*, 194 paces to the foot of the mountain. A channel twenty-two feet wide, cut in the rock, here begins, and is

continued for forty paces. The perpendicular face of this excavation being now about 100 feet, a noble tunnel commences, twenty-one feet wide, and at least as high. Ninety-eight paces brings you under a window, or long sky-light, cut down from the top to let in light. It is sixty-four paces more to the next window, up to which is a narrow flight of steps wrought in the rock. From this to the end of the tunnel is thirty-four paces, and from thence to the sea about 947 paces, cut in the solid rock throughout, but open at top. Through this tunnel the brook still flows, and it is the highway from this part of the plain, up the valley to the mountains. We rode along it, and found it crowded with cattle, sheep and goats, reposing, during the hot day, beneath the cool vault. It is a stupendous work, and the end seems scarcely to justify the vast expense of its execution.

The whole lower face of the mountains is perforated by innumerable tombs. I measured one room fifty-nine feet long and twenty-seven wide, having thirty-two full sized niches in it, of various shapes and styles of ornament, and another room communicates with it having 14 niches. The entrance was adorned with demi columns, and a handsome façade, and the roof, with large shell work and other ornamental devices. Generally, however, these tombs are very plain, and multitudes of them are broken and disfigured.

Seleucia was built by Seleucus Nicator, and its site possesses almost every advantage for a great city, except a harbor, and this was formerly supplied by art. It therefore rose rapidly to great eminence and wealth. The prospect, near and distant, combines both beauty and grandeur. The plain stretches some eight miles south, to the foot of Casius, which lifts its bald head to the clouds, like a mighty pyramid rising out of the sea. Near its base flows the "rebellious" Orontes, the only considerable river in Syria, and its tortuous meanderings are visible up to the wild gorge through which it issues from the eastern mountain. Most of this plain, of perhaps eight miles square, is covered with mulberry orchards; and from Kepsy to Swadea, the vegetation is particularly luxuriant, being everywhere well watered by copious fountains, which flow down from the sloping declivities of Jeble Mûsa. Notwithstanding this rank vegetation, and abundant irrigation, Swadea is healthy, owing undoubtedly, to the regular and vehement sea-breeze, or *inbat*, which, during summer and autumn, rushes up the valley of the Orontes between Casius and Jeble Mûsa. This effectually dissipates the miasma, and "defecates the standing pools" along the marshy shore.

The present population of the *plain* of Swadea (in which are included several small hamlets), is estimated by the Messrs. Barker at

about 9000. They are Ansairiyeh, Greeks and Armenians, an industrious, peaceable and honest sort of peasantry. The climate would be very hot were it not for the *inbat.* This relieves the *sensation of heat,* although I found that the thermometer, in the afternoon, in my room, ranged from 87 to 90. Mr. Barker declares they are never sick in Swadea, but this precious immunity from disease he thinks is mainly owing to the fact that they have no physicians!

The "Bay of Antioch" as the coast is called by Col. Chesney, is nothing but the open sea, as is shown by all accurate maps, and to call it "well sheltered on every side except the north-west," or indeed on *any* side, but the east, is to take unwarrantable liberties with the surrounding localities, or with the queen's English. Let no tempest-tossed mariner trust to its "shelter."

Seleucia called also Pieria from the mountain above it, is but one of nine cities erected, or enlarged and adorned, by Seleucus Nicator, and called after his own name. This Nicator was the greatest builder in the world. In addition to these nine, sixteen of his new cities, bore the name of his father Antiochus. Three were dedicated to the memory of his wife Apamia, and six were called after his mother Laodicea. It was from this port that Paul and Barnabas embarked on the first foreign mission; and after eighteen centuries have come and gone, a missionary from that western world unknown to prophets and apostles, sent to rekindle the lamp of life on these, now benighted shores, may be allowed to gaze upon this broken pier, and choked up harbor with peculiar emotion. When Paul stepped from these great stones into his boat, bound for Cyprus, the kingdom of heaven began its *westward* march, and for eighteen hundred years it has steadily adhered to the line of its early election—*westward* to Greece, to Italy, to Spain, to Britain—and westward over the wide ocean to America, and westward still is its march to the shores of the Pacific, and far, far beyond, to the green isles that sleep in its ample bosom.

A few miles south of the harbor of Seleucia is a large Zeareh or Mazar of el-Khûdr (St. George). Its white-washed dome is a conspicuous object from the sea, and the superstitious mariners make vows and prayers to this very popular Saint, as they sail along the coast. Our captain, though a Moslem, threw money into the sea for his saintship, when he found his beloved boat must be driven on shore. The Ansairiyeh also hold el-Khûdr in the highest veneration. Mr. Barker informed me that after all the harvests, and fruits of the year are gathered in, the Ansairiyeh from the mountains around, assemble in immense numbers, to hold a feast and offer a great sacrifice at this Mazar.

This feast seems to resemble the Jewish festival of ingathering, see Ex. 23: 16. Women and children, as well as men crowd to the place, but when the religious sacrifice and ceremonies are performed, only a few of the head sheikhs enter the Mazar, and a trusty guard is placed all around, at a distance, to prevent any intrusion into their dark mysteries.

The geological indications about Swadea point to a time when the plain formed a deep bay extending inland some ten miles to the foot of the mountain. The soil is a rich marly deposit of the river, mingled with volcanic pepperite, trap boulders, and water worn stones and pebbles. This pepperite is consolidated into a *hard volcanic grit*, along the base of the hills north of Swadea. As there is no basis of rock within reach, the foundation of the houses of Swadea are laid in this marly deposit. This absence of rock rendered it comparatively easy, I suppose, to excavate a harbor, and the work was actually achieved by the Syro-Macedonian kings. The process of filling up, and enlarging the plain, still goes on. The water of the Orontes has a whitish-blue tinge from the great amount of marl held in solution, and the line of coast is, by its constant deposition, gradually encroaching upon the sea around the mouth of the river.

The most valuable product of Swadea is silk, of which there is grown about 300 cantars annually. The Messrs. Barker have introduced the Italian cocoon and mulberry, and are now using the *short reel* to prepare the silk for European markets. This must ultimately impart great activity to the business, and increase many fold the amount of silk produced. Mr. Barker has a beautiful mountain residence, three hours distant in an Armenian village called Btias, where are some fine ruins of ancient temples or churches. He thinks that this is the Biblias or Babylas of ecclesiastical celebrity, but probably this honor belongs to another village some distance further north which still preserves the name amongst its Armenian inhabitants. Btias is also a silk growing village, and abounds with noble fountains by which the mulberry plantations are irrigated. Mr. Barker has expended much time and capital on his garden and fruit orchards at this place, and with very happy success. In this secluded mountain retreat, amongst fruits and flowers, he is spending the evening of a long and checkered life with, he believes, a sky as lovely, and an air as balmy as this world affords. All peace and prosperity to his green old age!

Aug. 10*th.* It took us five hours to ride to Antioch, on the miserable hacks hired in Swadea—distance fifteen or sixteen miles. Started at eight and in fifteen minutes crossed a small river called N. ez-Zeitune. At the end of one hour rose a considerable hill, having passed

over beds of volcanic sand and marl, succeeded by pebbles and gum-stone boulders—and this again, by fieldspathic trachyte, argite rock, granite boulders, jasper, agate, arenacious marls, volcanic tuff, etc., in chaotic confusion. In two hours crossed Kerajak el-Kebeer, a wide, straggling river, coming down from Mount Rhossius north of Btias, and falling into the Orontes. From this to Karajak es-Sugeer is fifteen minutes, and forty minutes more to N. Hasseinly, where is a ruined church dedicated to St. Spiridion, an old grave-yard, and a large oak tree, under which we took shelter from a burning sun. These land-marks will all attract attention on this utterly desert road. The hills thus far are covered with oak and other coppice, henceforward they are naked. From N. H. to N. Mûrr is three quarters of an hour. Here is an extraordinary conglomerate of water-worn volcanic pebbles, and stones of various mineralogical ingredients. From this to N. Hanna is thirty-five minutes, and to Antioch ten minutes more. Alas, for the desolations of Syria! Between this once great capital of the East, and its celebrated port of Seleucia there is not a village on the road and but little cultivation.

On a former occasion, I travelled across the country from Btias to Daphne, passing the Orontes in a boat, and swimming my horse by its side. The course of the river here is nearly south, and the fountains of Daphne are on the east side. They burst out of a ledge of perpendicular lime rock, and leaping and foaming over successive terraces, down a steeply inclined plain for a mile or two, fall into the Orontes. Here are the fountains just as they were 2000 years ago, but where are the solemn groves of laurel, bay and cypress? spoken of by Sozomen. Where, the lofty columns, ~~the~~ magnificent temples, the shady walks, the noisy cascades, the silvery pools, the playful *jet d'eaux*—the delight, the glory and the wonder of the world? According to Strabo and others of olden time, gone, all gone—the altars are fallen, the images stamped to dust, the gold and the gems have filled the coffers, and adorned the palaces and the persons of other nations, in other climes. Daphne, the beautiful and the idolized, has fled from her favorite haunt, and where the mellow music of a hundred fountains fell in soft cadences upon the soothed ear, a half-dozen chattering mills now grind corn for the peasant, and discord for the disappointed traveller. Cows standing in the stream, and buffaloes wallowing in the mire regale the senses with their abominations, where spicy groves once shed their fragrant odors. Daphne, sweet and blushing, of course is not there, but a few curly-headed, sunburnt, unwashed wenches came carrying corn to mill on their backs. And as the disappointed and wearied visitor broils in the fierce rays of the

sun, he will sigh for the "peaceful groves consecrated to health and joy, to luxury and love,"—and if he be hungry, as I was, he would gladly partake of "Julian's solitary goose," if he could find such a repast in this utter desolation. As all the world knows, it is five miles from Daphne to Antioch, and there is evidence that most of this distance was, at one time, covered by the extensive suburbs of that great city.

The name Daphne occurs far back in ancient history. According to 2 Mac. 4: 33, Onias, the high priest fled (to the temple) at Daphne near Antioch, and being treacherously drawn out of his sanctuary by Andronicus was slain.

Jerome takes the Riblah mentioned in Numb. 34: 11 to be Antioch, and Ain to be Daphne. And in the Arabic (translated from the Vulgate "contra fontem Dapnim") this passage reads "over against, or opposite to Daphne." This false translation, perhaps, first suggested to Jerome the idea that Riblah and Antioch were the same; and from this source a long series of mistakes has arisen. Dr. Keith constructs much of his argument for the northern border of the Land of Promise, upon the passage thus translated and paraphrased.

An effort to explain the confusion growing out of this translation may possibly have led, in later times, to find or invent a Daphne at Banias—the fountains of the Jordan. For, to jump the land-marks over mountain and plain from Daphne at Antioch, to Chineroth, or Tiberias, must have appeared a difficult exploit. And yet Numbers 34: 11 requires this, if Riblah is Antioch and Ain be Daphne.

Antioch. It is difficult to decide what to write after this name. A city, once the third in size, beauty and wealth in the Roman world; long the capital of the Syro-Macedonian empire—the city where men were first called Christians—and from which, even to this day, the patriarchs of the East derive their great sounding titles. Where the Seleucidae, the Caesars, the Constantines, the Persians, the Arabs, the Tartars, the Turks, the Franks have all successively fought, bled, conquered, reigned and disappeared. This is no ordinary locality. Built by Seleucus Nicator, and called after his father, it was enlarged and beautified by his successors, until it contained, as tradidition reports, 700,000 inhabitants—famed the world over for soft refinement, luxury and licentiousness. Under the Byzantian emperors, Antioch was most known as the rival Patriarchate to Constantinople. This lordly priest possessed jurisdiction over about 150 metropolitans —his name was all powerful, from the extremity of Arabia to the north of Mesopotamia. His list of ecclesiastical sees comprised almost

every name celebrated in oriental history—Seleucia (two of this name), Boerhea (Aleppo), Chalcis (Zobah of Bible), Apamia, Arethusa, Hamah, Hums, Salemiyeh, Samosata, Philadelphia (two of them), Zeugma, Edessa, Jerusalem, Tyre, Sidon, Akka, Beirût, Tripoli, Orthosia, Aradus, Arca, Panias, Laodicea, Jebilee, Tarsûs, Damascus, Heliopolis, the Ba'albek of our day, Palmyra, Bosra, and a hundred other historical names. How wretchedly fallen from its ancient glory! It is now a village of no political importance, and though the Greek and Greek Catholic and Maronite Patriarchs still call themselves by the august title of "Antioch and the East," not one of them has a church there. A few Greeks, worshipping in a private room, or saying *kuddas* by some ruin, are the only mementos of her former ecclesiastical glory. The name of Christ, honored and adored throughout the civilized world, is blasphemed at Antioch. A few fanatical Moslems, and depraved Ansairiyeh possess the ancient capital of the East, and of Christianity.

Antioch has fallen and forever. All nations have been called to aid in her destruction. The Persians sacked it, the Moslems pillaged it. It was ravaged by the Tartars. It was ruined by the Turks. Many times earthquakes have overthrown it, and fire has consumed it. Pestilence, again and again, depopulated it. Finally, commerce diverted, dried up the source of its prosperity, and for ages it has sunk into obscurity. And it most probably must ever remain subordinate and insignificant. Should rail-roads once more turn the tide of eastern trade and wealth to the head of this sea, it will very likely roll down the valley of the Orontes, but it will not pause one moment at Antioch, but hasten to the port at Seleucia. Antioch has, therefore, no prospect of ever regaining her former position. Still all the patriarchs of the East cleave to the name—the *name* preserved, while the thing is gone—a striking symbol of their whole system.

Antioch, fallen as she is, still retains her old habits, vices and corruptions. In open day, women came round our tent and sought to attract attention by their lewd songs, and in the evening, as Ibn Beshara and I were returning from Bab Bûlus, we met a troop of these *un*equivocal characters, strolling the streets. I never saw this in any other town in Syria.

Those who wish to know how the walls of Antioch look, may purchase any one of the thousand pictures of them. True, no such representation can be very satisfactory, but it is still more difficult to draw a satisfactory picture with the pen. The pen climbs the rugged rocks on the east of the city, without fatigue, traverses yonder dizzy

crags, and rugged ravines with ease, and descend to Bab Bûlus at the end of a single sentence. But this feat, actually performed, is a hard morning's work. It was a singular idea to run the wall up this steep mountain to the top and then carry it along the ledge of rock so far, across yawning gorges, and foaming torrents. Such a prolongation of the wall must have increased greatly the difficulty of maintaining the defences. And but a very small portion of this mountain, thus included within the walls, could have been occupied by buildings, except those of the dead. These sepulchral excavations were numerous and the perpendicular rocks are admirably adapted for a city of the dead. Benjamin of Tudela says that there was a fountain on the top of this mountain, from which water was distributed to the houses. This is probably a mistake, but there is still a fountain on the side of the hill, high enough for such a purpose. And the tradition is probably well founded that the water of Daphne was brought to Antioch. The remains of this great city are quite insignificant, and there is no trace of Phenician work, or of anything older than the era of the Seleucidae, if indeed any part can lay claim to so early a date. According to some ancient authors it would appear that the Orontes once ran through the city, but there is not the least appearance of that at present. The walls along the *eastern* bank of the river are apparently the most ancient of all, and if there ever was a suburb on the *west* bank all traces of it have disappeared. For ages this has been the general cemetery of the city. Antioch must, however, have extended to the south, far beyond the walls toward Daphne. The space within the walls could never have accommodated one half the inhabitants. The inclosed area practicable for building, is not more than two miles long, and one broad. Only a small portion of this, is occupied by the houses of the present town—the remainder is planted with mulberry and fruit trees. In many parts, it is a wilderness where a stranger may easily get *be*wildered as I was, in one of my evening rambles.

Much of the stone lying about these gardens is black trap rock, and the bridge over the river is paved with compact greenstone. Columns, buried under rubbish, appear here and there, and now and then a broken capital, but the traveller is disappointed in his search for antiquities or inscriptions. It is singularly barren in all these historical elements. In the legends of chivalry, and in the songs of the Troubadour, it has far more enduring memorials. And any one who has read Michaud's splendid History of the Crusaders will wander amongst the ruins and over the plains of Antioch with intense emotions. Deeds of chivalry almost unequalled in daring, immortalize every foot of the soil. But these are themes fitter for the "minstrel's lay" than the

brief notes of a passing traveller. Both in the city and on the hills, especially around Daphne—now called Beit el-Mâ—the bay-tree flourishes luxuriantly. And they suggest thoughts more instructive than the "Tales of the Palmer," or the "Chronicles of Crusades." Every child has learnt from David that the *prosperity* of the wicked is like to a green bay-tree. And truly those of Daphne afford a beautiful emblem of a flourishing family. You there see large trees perfectly green and vigorous surrounded by a dozen hale and thriving young plants springing from their roots—like a patriarch encircled with his family of stalwart sons. But though his prosperity appeared to be as enduring as the bay-tree, yet he passed away, and lo, he was not; yea, I sought him, but he could not be found.

An astonishing succession of earthquakes during the sixth and seventh centuries repeatedly overthrew Antioch, burying beneath the ruins each time multitudes of the inhabitants. On one occasion the earth continued to rock for forty days, and volumes of sulphurous smoke issued from the ground and nearly suffocated the people. At another time the coast sank and rose, and the sea encroached upon the land, according to the account of Ibn Shehny. I think it not improbable that by some of these terrible convulsions the gate of the harbor of Seleucia was so much elevated as to render it useless, and if so, this will give both the date and the course of the total desertion and destruction of this city and harbor, as well as the ruin of Antioch. All the old authors mention these awful overthrows of Antioch. From their effects it never could entirely recover, although the Byzantine emperors made extraordinary efforts to restore their splendid eastern capital. If the supposition of the rising of the coast at the harbor of Seleucia proves true, the cause of the permanent and utter decline of Antioch is at once explained. Commerce and trade would thereby be immediately and finally directed to Scandaroon and Ladakîa and settle upon Aleppo as the great centre of exchange with eastern caravans.

11*th*. We left Antioch at one o'clock, and four hours' brisk riding by morning moonlight, brought us to Jisr el-Hadîd, where we crossed the Orontes. Here is a very substantial bridge, built since 1822, in which year the great earthquake of Aleppo broke down the old one. There is a guard-house with a gate built on the bridge, and on the south bank of the river is a small village with two or three badly supplied shops, where the traveller can perhaps purchase something to eat, and certainly something to smoke. The water of the river is of a muddy drab color, occasioned by the continual erosion of the banks, which are of a blueish earthy marl. No doubt the vast long plain,

which requires two or three days to ride round it, is entirely a fresh water deposit, and it is still extensively overflowed in winter. It was, in fact, a large lake, the small remnant of which is found in the Yagara or Bahr Agoula, more commonly called the Lake of Antioch. The Orontes and Nahr el-Burak from the south, and Aphreen and Aswad from the east and north-east have for countless ages been filling up this lake, and enlarging the plain, and this work will one day be completed and the lake wholly disappear. At some remote period, this plain was crowded with people. Hundreds of artificial mounds, some very large, were raised all over it. These were doubtless occupied by the peasants who cultivated the surrounding fields, much as the Mexicans did, when Cortez first visited that fair and fairy land. I counted forty-one mounds from a single station.

The land of this plain belongs to government, and as a natural and necessary consequence, is almost entirely abandoned and useless. It might all be brought under the highest cultivation. Every foot of it could be irrigated by canals from the several rivers which find their way through it, to the lake; and rice, cotton, madder and corn might be grown to any amount; or it might be planted with mulberry orchards for the production of silk. A single Nauza or Persian water-wheel, will raise water sufficient for 30,000 mulberry trees, and the cost of constructing the wheel is only about 200 dollars. This is the whole expense, and yet there is neither capital nor enterprise in the country to achieve this work. Let Europeans or Americans enter upon the work, and this magnificent plain will soon be like the garden of Eden. And when rail-ways bring the trade and the travel of the East down the valley of the Orontes, this delightful renovation will spring up like magic. A better government, however, is indispensable to success. The peasant is now cruelly oppressed. If he settles on any of these lands he engages to pay a tenth to government. This is moderate enough. But the collectors make the estimates according to their own selfish purposes, and hence arises immense oppression. They will determine that a man's fields have produced 100 bushels of wheat, for example, and take the tenth according to this estimate, while he has not in fact realized 20 bushels; and in the same way every other article of produce is taxed. Thus left at the mercy of the collectors, the poor farmer is utterly ruined, and obliged to flee from his house and abandon his labor. No improvement is to be expected on this system.

The houses in this region are built of large sun-dried brick—two feet long, one broad, and six inches thick. I watched the process of brick-making, as we lay under the shade of a great mulberry tree at

the foot of the bridge. One man tramped the mortar with his feet; a woman threw in chopped straw and chaff; another woman supplied the water which was handed her from the river by a man entirely naked; another man shaped the bricks, and boys and girls carried them to a distance and ranged them on the ground to dry in the sun and wind. The veils of the women are in place on such occasions certainly. The people in this region are sadly degraded—there is not a Christian church, or a school of any kind in all these villages. When will such utter desolations revive! Kurds and Arabs wander now and then with their flocks, over these fertile plains, and then disappear like birds of passage. From Jisr el-Hadîd, Mount Casius bore 260; highest point of Jeble el-Aala, 160; of Mount Rhossius, 295; of Jeble Ghawir Dâg, 352.

Between these mountains the wind at this season rushes up the plain from the sea, a hot, dry and merciless tempest. It is almost impossible to endure it. The intense heat of the plain, I suppose, produces rarefaction to such an extent that the sea air is drawn in, with immense vehemence, to fill the void. Whatever be the cause it is now incessant, day and night, and so violent as to be very disagreeable.

In three hours from Jisr Hadîd we come to Harim, which is pleasantly situated on the eastern border of the plain, upon a salient spur of Jeble el-Aala. There was (and still remains in tolerable preservation) a circular castle on an artificial mound—the base of which is the termination of the hill—cut off on the upper side by a deep ditch, and strengthened by a wall and towers. It was a plain of strength and importance, not only with the first Moslems, but with the Crusaders. Copious fountains refresh the fields, and cultivation is carried to a higher degree of perfection than in the neighboring villages. Groves of poplar and other trees also add much to the beauty of the spot. Abu el-Fida, Ibn Shehny, and other Arabic geographers, speak of this tower and castle. It received the name of Little Damascus, on account of the abundance of its fountains, and the excellence of its fruits. For many centuries it was the capital of a large sub-province, but it has shared the general fortunes of the country, and has sunk into an insignificant village. There are some curious old ruins on the north of Harim, and what appears to have been, at one time, an aqueduct. The plain stretches away northwards—a boundless expansion of luxuriant verdure; and our road leads over a low, rocky point eastward, to el-Burak—a handsome *cheflik* (or farm) owned by a Turkish grandee of Constantinople. The large farm houses, newly white-washed—*a la* Constantinople style—rise on a beautiful ascent near the banks of the pretty Burak. This crystal brook is crowded

with fish, and hereabouts, covered with geese and ducks—a rare sight in Syria. I have not seen a sweeter farm-scene in the East. The Burak flows down from a narrow vale on the east side of Jeble el-Aala, and crossing the plain westward from this *cheflik*, falls into the Lake of Antioch. There was anciently a large town at this place, the ruins of which are to be seen, scattered over the hill north-east of the ford. A bridge of several arches once spanned the brook, and we now cross on its ruins.

12*th.* We slept on the margin of the Burak, or more properly, spent some six hours of the night in an earnest contest with this merciless wind, when, finding it impossible to keep our tent erect, we struck, and started at 2 o'clock, A. M. and went on to Dana, a ride of 4½ hours, direction east by north. During the latter half of this ride our attention was constantly attracted to a constant succession of old ruins, on all sides of us. They are of various styles of architecture, partly Grecian, partly of a tortuous, mixed order, and of a very uncertain age. They fill the reflecting mind with wonder and sorrow. What has become of the hundreds of thousands of intelligent, prosperous, wealthy people, who once crowded these plains, and built cities, temples, and palaces, all over these hills?

At Dana we took refuge from a burning sun, and persecuting wind, in an old building, once a church or temple, now a mosque. It is a heavy vaulted building, mostly in ruins.

Passing through large fields of castor bean, maize and cotton, we began, in half an hour, to rise over a rocky hill; and in the valley beyond it, came to some very old remains, with a large ruined town some two miles further south. After ascending another rocky hill, we pitched our tent at Deir et-Tîn, two hours from Dana, and six from Aleppo. The rock thus far has been mostly a compact limestone often semi-crystalline. From this to Aleppo the cretaceous and marly formations abound. This little village is distinguished for its cisterns. The whole cretaceous hill is perforated with them, but the water is an abominable decoction, from stables and barn-yard drippings, and swarms with minute red worms, very lively, but not at all desirable qualifications to a thirsty man's potations. The *Deir* is gone if there ever was one, but the orchards are just now loaded with excellent *Tîn*—figs. We placed a high wall between us and this hot, parching, pitiless wind, ate something or other for dinner, *cooked* a pot full of this *living* water for tea, and threw ourselves on the ground to sleep.

13*th.* Rose at midnight, took a guide and set out to visit the ruins on Jeble St. Simon, leaving the luggage to proceed to Aleppo direct.

We travelled *across* the mountains by a blind path—most execrable road—floundering in the dark, over rude rocks, for four hours and a half, when we reached the main ruins just as the sun rose. These mountains are full of deserted villages, and old towns in melancholy desolation. Huge gray rocks, "as old as the hills," utterly disrobed of all verdure, and even of soil, are piled up in hopeless, desperate confusion. Amongst these remains of ancient architecture, stand towns, and temples, and cities, and castles of by-gone centuries, and extinct races. They are constructed of large smooth cut stones, carried up from the foundation, in single layers, and without mortar. They are probably Graeco-Roman, and of the Lower Empire. Many of the private habitations were large and spacious, with upper and lower porticoes, supported by columns of various shapes, and undefined, and undefinable orders—neither Phenician, Grecian, Roman, Saracenic, or Arabic—a degenerate, bastard generation—column, capital, cornice and all. But these ruins are altogether surprising in extent and solidity of structure. Towns and temples built of smooth chiseled stones ten feet long and two square, arranged one on another from base to battlement, stand all over these hills in utter solitude.

These halls deserted, now echo only the wail of the jackal or the hooting of the owl. My previous reading had not prepared me for this morning's ramble amongst the habitations of races long dead, and the heart saddened and sickened at the dismal sight.

The main attraction of Jeble Simôn is the Kulah or castle—a large temple, church, or convent, or all in succession, according as men of different nations and opposing creeds held possession. The principal building is in the form of a grand cross, the centre forming a magnificent octagon. The length inside is 253 feet 6 inches, the width is 76 feet. The diameter of the octagon is 89 feet 6 inches, and the length of each side is 35 feet 7½ inches. There are two beautiful Corinthian columns in each of the eight angles—sixteen in all—about fifteen feet long. From an entablature on the top of these columns, spring the eight ground arches which supported the dome of the octagon. It is thirty-two feet to the centre of the arches; and a very heavy, and most elaborately decorated cornice and fringe, run all round their noble curvatures. Eight shorter columns occupied the superior angles, resting upon pedestals above the main columns. Above these there appear to have been projecting pedestals for images or statues; and beautifully carved tracery covered the interior face of the lofty dome. The whole, when perfect, must have been eighty feet high—an impressive and august rotunda. The live rock of the hill has been cut away, to form the platform of this immense structure,

and a pedestal of it is left exactly under the centre of the dome, as if for an idol or a statue, and possibly it was the base of the column or "stile" upon which St. Simon stood. The crest of the hill lies N. E. and S. W., and this is the direction of the temple. The principal entrance is from the south-west. The stile here is highly decorated Corinthian, massive, lofty and grand. The wall is at present about seventy feet high, and immensely strong. The interior is choked up with an infinite amount of broken columns, capitals, and prostrate arches, fatiguing the eye and the limbs of the visitor in his rambles. The east, or rather south-east wing, has, at some time or other, been transformed into a church. The circular nave is adorned on the *outside* by an upper and lower range of Corinthian columns producing a fine appearance from the hill on the south of the temple. In effecting the transformation, the elaborately wrought original doors, windows, and cornice, have been built up, and concealed by an interior wall. The length of this church inside is 129 feet 6 inches, and the breadth 77 feet. It would be an endless task to explain in detail, the position and character of the numerous side cloisters, small chapels, and recesses of this vast pile, and still more tedious and unsatisfactory to describe the immense buildings attached to it, particularly on the south-west side. There are some very peculiar and surprising sepulchres on the south-east angle of the external court or yard, which will attract the attention of every visitor. There are no fountains, but immense cisterns supply their place. The rock beneath the whole length of the temple is perforated with these indispensable reservoirs. Hither the flocks of the wild Yezidy shepherds are still brought twice a day, when the otherwise desolate scene is sufficiently lively.

The prospect northward, over the plain and the valley Nehor Apprin is surprisingly lovely, but in any other direction the eye wanders fatigued over bare, gray rocks, or huge old ruins, as bare and as gray. The rock is a white compact sub-crystalline limestone, richly fossiliferous in many specimens which I examined. It takes a beautiful polish, as is manifest from the columns and tracery of the grand octagon.

By whom were these ruins constructed, when, and for what purpose? These are questions for others to answer. My historical reading, both Arabic and European, casts but little light on the subject, and there is nothing very decisive in the architectural indications. They appear to have been erected in different ages, and for different purposes. I could find no inscriptions of any kind except names of European travellers who visited the temple in former days, mostly in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. On some of the columns

there are circular and highly involved figures, so carved as to appear to have formed part of the original design. They may have had a mystic signification. The Arabic historian of Aleppo, Ibn Shehny, calls this place Kefr Nebo, and says that anciently an idol, called Nebo, was worshipped in this temple. This is the name of a Babylonian divinity, and the tradition may go for what it is worth. A part of it at least, was certainly used as a Christian church during one period of its history. Many of the buildings in these mountains are evidently of Christian origin, and probably owe their existence to the first invasions of the Moslems, about the middle of the seventh century. The defeated Christians fled from the cities and the open country to these savage and impracticable deserts, and there reared these heavy buildings, half castle, half church or convent, as the case might be. The style, however, is very different from any purely Grecian or Roman city whose ruins exist at the present day. The stones are heavier, the work more massive, the arrangement awkward, and unscientific, and the whole is laid up without mortar. Many things lead me to suspect that most of these buildings which cover the long ranges of mountains from Sâfetâ northwards through the Jeble el-Aala and St. Simon, were constructed out of materials wrought by a more ancient people than the Syro-Greek Christians of the seventh and eighth centuries. Both in Jeble el-Aala and St. Simon the *arch* is unknown in the heaviest and most antique buildings; and as there is no patch work about these specimens, they may possibly exhibit undisturbed examples of the handiwork of a very remote race. On these questions, however, it does not become me to pronounce an opinion. One thing is certain, we shall not again meet a single trace of Phenician architecture until we reach Ba'albek. In a wilderness of ruins extending southwards for hundreds of miles, and often in sight of the Phenician coast, there is not one stone with the Phenician *bevel*. This early maritime people appear to have confined themselves to the seaboard, and in all the cities, from Ladakîa to Gaza, the peculiar cut of their chisel can be traced, but if you ascend to the summit of the hills which separated them from the interior plains of Syria, all signs of their work disappear suddenly and totally, except in a very few instances far south, where the Jews seem to have borrowed both the workmen and the style from their Syrian neighbors. This peculiar *bevel* is therefore the distinctive mark of the Phenician architect, and as such I always look upon every old stone which bears these credentials of a very honorable antiquity, with particular respect. I would give something to know whether it is met with amongst the ruins of Carthage! But of this enough.

The shepherds who wander, with their flocks, amongst these ancient desolations, are mostly Yezidees—a strange, wild race, of very dubious reputation. The prevalent opinion in regard to their religious veneration of the Evil principle, and of his very reputable companion and symbol, the serpent, is undoubtedly well founded; but with what particular rites they endeavor to maintain friendly relations with his satanic majesty, I could not ascertain. I may refer to this people again.

Very old tradition connects the name of St. Simon Stylites with these ruins, and, as before intimated, I think it probable that the column reared upon the base or pedestal of live rock, in the centre of the octagon, was selected by the saint to be the theatre of his astounding exploit. The fallen blocks are much broken, and appear as if they may have been diminished by the hammers of devout pilgrims, who flocked to this holy shrine from all parts of the Christian world, and were, no doubt, anxious to carry home some of the sacred stone as precious mementoes or efficacious amulets. I found a very old Arabic volume in Aleppo, which professes to give the history of St. Simon. It is filled with incredible legends and accounts of stupendous miracles, recorded with resolute and even desperate gravity. Additions appear to have been made to the original chronicle, from time to time, one of which says that "pilgrims came to the sacred shrine even from America." Anachronisms of this kind are of no significancy, and will scarcely attract attention amidst the splendor of such transcendant miracles as are constantly achieved by this prince of saints. The church constructed out of the south-east wing of this grand temple, was probably made for the accommodation of the vast crowds of pilgrims. And the numerous buildings attached to different parts, were for monks and anchorites who were wedded to the spot by the fame of the holy man.

Here, then, was displayed that most hideous abortion of blind fanaticism. A living man perched upon the end of a pillar three feet in diameter and 50, 60, or 70 feet high, according to different accounts. There he stood, day and night, without descending, for thirty-seven years, in winter's winds and snows, and summer's scorching sun, muttering prayers, making ten thousand dangerous and painful genuflections, and giving utterance to mysterious predictions to the demented and awe-struck multitude below. How he did contrive, on this dizzy pinnacle, to bow down till his forehead touched the top of the column at his feet, is not easily understood; but an eye-witness declares that he saw him perform the exploit 1244 times, and then he left off counting! Any one curious to see what kind of marvels are religiously re-

lated, by grave historians, about this monstrous manifestion of ascetic mania, may consult Stephanus, or Theodoret, or St. Anthony, or Cosmos, or the somewhat tedious epitome of the whole in Assemann's Bib. Orient. Vol. I. The temptation to translate from my old Arabic author must be resisted for want of time and space; and we leave it to some of our modern lovers of legendary lore, to do justice to the memory and the merits of this unparalleled saint.

There are the remains of a column on the top of a mountain, some six miles east of Swadea, and Mr. Barker supposes that this is the site of Simon's Pillar. Pilgrimages are still made to it on this account by the superstitious, and it appears, from time immemorial, to have been regarded as the spot by the surrounding Christians. And since some ancient authors mention different pillars, it is possible that the saint may have occupied one on this promontory for a season. But I think it more probable that this was the *pillory* of Simeon Stylites junior, who maintained his awkward post for sixty-eight years!! according to the testimony of Evagrius, who was personally acquainted with this remarkable *junior* gentleman.

It took me eight hours to ride from the *Kulah* to Aleppo. The road leads over low rocky hills, utterly destitute of trees, and, in August at least, of vegetation. The soil has, for ages, been washed off the rocks into small side valleys, which in spring are, no doubt, green enough, but now they are of a burnt-iron rust color, very naked and very dreary. Ancient ruins are scattered over the hills, and as you approach Aleppo villages begin to appear.

Aleppo. I shall bring into one connected narrative the substance of my miscellaneous notes about this important city and the regions adjacent to, and depending upon it. The origin, the name, and the ancient history of Aleppo are involved in obscurity. It is the Boerhea of the Greeks, and in the Syrian and Armenian ecclesiastical books of the present day, it still bears this name. Ibn Shehny, the Arabic historian of Aleppo, has collected with much industry and from many authors, the ancient traditions in relation to the name and primitive history of his native city. He gives different versions of the fable of Abraham ("upon whom be peace") milking his flocks at castle-hill—all of which, however, derive the name *Haleb* from this *milking* operation. The Patriarch, it seems, possessed the Moslem virtue of almsgiving in an eminent degree; and when he milked his flocks at the hill, a crier from the summit proclaimed حلب ابراهيم (*haleb* Abraham) Abraham has milked—his flocks, and immediately the pauper crowd assembled for their daily portion. From the constant repetition of this call, the name became appropriated to the hill itself and subsequently to the

city that was built around it. Ibn Shehny, however, appears to regard all these traditions as somewhat apochryphal, and evidently acquiesces in the opinion of those who derive the name from the milk-white chalk hills upon which it is built. It is, nevertheless, curious to see how pertinaciously Moslem authors insist upon the reality of Abraham's residence. One author, however, quoted by Ibn Shehny, says that Haleb and Hums, Ibn Mahir, Ibn Hums, Ibn Hâb (in another genealogy it is Ibn Hâm), Ibn Maknif, of the children of Amalîuk, built Haleb and Hums. And again, he says that the occasion of building Haleb, was the expulsion of the Amalekites from Palestine by Joshua. But then this same author in another place maintains that Haleb has been in existence ever since the visit of Khalîl (the beloved), that is, Abraham "upon whom be peace." And once more—an author with a string of *Ibns* to his pedigree altogether too long to copy, states that the king of Nineveh, called Belukush, or Belkhurus, built Aleppo and compelled the Jews to inhabit it—and Ibn Shehny adds—*Allah* knows whether this is not he whom the Greeks call Sardanapalus. Finally, Ibn Shehny declares that he found it recorded in an ancient author called Ashuarus, that in the first year of the Alexandrian era, Seleucus Nicanor built Seleucia and Apamia, and Riha, and Haleb, and Ladakîa;—so much for Ibn Shehny. Benjamin of Tudela says without the least hesitation, that it is the Aram Zobah of Scripture. This is probably a mistake into which the Jewish tourist fell by confounding Aleppo with Kunserîn, whose ruins are about a day's journey south-east of Aleppo. Ibn Shehny says that Kunserîn was a great city before Aleppo was built, and at first called *Sûria*, from which he derives the name Syria. It was the capital of the kingdom or province in which Aleppo is situated, and gave name to the whole country as far as the Euphrates. When Kunserîn declined and Aleppo rose to distinction there arose a confusion in authors, who were not always careful to distinguish between the ancient name of the province and its actual capital. The south-east gate of Aleppo is still called Kunserîn, and this name figures largely in all the old Syriac and Arabic writers upon this region. Girgius el-Makîn in his Saracenic history, says that Kunserîn was conquered A. D. 636 by Abu Aubeid, after a sharp contest, and probably the whole province, including Aleppo, was brought under Mohammedan rule at that early day. It, however, often changed masters subsequently.

Most modern geographers identify Kunserîn—the Chalcis of the Greeks—with Zobah or Hamath Zobah of the sacred Scriptures. This may be correct, but when visiting the great "salt vale," some

twenty miles south-east of Aleppo, I heard of a very ancient ruin on the south-eastern margin of the vale, which the Arabs call Zobah or Zebah, and some appeared to me to pronounce it Zebad. They told me that the ruins were much older than those of Kunserîn, and covered a space as large as Aleppo; and moreover, that, at this place was the only fresh water on the south shore of this salt lake or vale. As this is probably the salt vale where David conquered Hadadezer, king of Zobah, when he went to recover his border on the Euphrates (2 Kings 8: 3—13), I think it not improbable that this Zebah marks the site of Hadadezer's capital; David may have destroyed it, and in the subsequent prosperity of the kingdom of Zobah, Kunserîn may have become the capital. It is a full day's journey west of Zebah, and all that distance from the salt vale, where David overthrew Hadadezer. The position of Zebah, therefore, agrees best with the Bible account of David's expedition. Our narrative having led us to this *salt vale*, I may as well complete what I have to say in regard to it.

I left Aleppo on the 18th of August, with a company of friends, and rode to Sphery—anciently called Sephra—situated near the western border of the *vale*. Passing out of the city by the gate of Kunserîn, we rode over chalk hills planted with the pistachio tree, for half an hour, and were then in the open desert. As we advanced through boundless tracts of unappropriated land, the villages became more and more rare, until we reached Sphery, from whence to the Euphrates it is "without inhabitant." Sphery is a large village. The houses are built of *sun*-dried bricks—shaped like large *haystacks*—huddled close together like their types in a Western barn-yard, with narrow *circular* streets or paths between stacks, leading to *anywhere* you please. This is the universal style throughout all these deserts, between this and Hums. They present a most original and striking appearance. The Moslem inhabitants—half citizens, half Bedouins—received us with great cordiality. A large *haystack* was placed at our disposal—and, of as many of the villagers as it would hold. We drank any quantity of coffee, and the smoke of any number of pipes escaping through the apex, made our *stack* somewhat like a young volcano. But we were entertained with very lively talk from these rude sons of the "Border." Many of them had wandered far into the desert—had been to Zebah, and to Khanasorah, which they always confound with its ruined neighbor Kunserîn, though they are really distinct places. From their accounts there are many columns with inscriptions, etc. at Kunserîn. I exhausted all my persuasive powers in vain efforts to induce some of them to conduct me to these interesting ruins, offering to start at once, and ride all night. But they

steadfastly asserted that it was impossible at this season to reach them, on account of the Anazy Arabs. They are in such dread of these wild robbers, that, after sunset no one would go even to the neighboring vineyards, to bring us grapes—nor would they venture out at all without being completely armed. These Arabs have been particularly troublesome of late.

Our friends here assure me that from Khânâsir they can ride to Hamah in a day, directly through the open desert. An old Arab author—Ibn Shiddar—quoted by Ibn Shehny, says that Khânâsir was a large city with walls, castles, etc., built of black (trap) rock. He derives the name from the man who built it—Khânâsir. Another old Arab author says that there was a city here called Kunsarîn the less, which he says was the Chalcis of the Greeks, and was mentioned in the Hebrew Scriptures under the name of Zoma—the Zobah of the Bible misspelt. He says that it derived its name from an Arab chief of the Beni Keis. Ibn Haukel, in his Geography, says that Kunsarîn was destroyed by the emperor Basilius, after which it was repeatedly rebuilt and overthrown, until it was entirely demolished by Taj ed-Dowleh at the close of the eleventh century. Amongst the rebuilders of Kunsarîn which he mentions are the Beni Busseis et-Tenukhiyeh—the ancestors, probably, of the Tenukh Emeers who built these palaces here in Abeih where I am now writing this note. These Emeers were exterminated in a dreadful massacre, several hundred years ago, but their palaces still remain. The name Keis is also still perpetuated amongst us—the Druzes being divided into Beni Keis and Beni Yemen. The leading sheikhs of Beni Keis emigrated to Lebanon long ago from the province of Kunsarîn. The ancestors of Naaman Beg Jemblat came from Maarat Naaman which belonged to the same province. And in Aleppo itself, I found an old palace called Seraiyet Beit Jemblat—and since my return, Naaman Beg has assured me that his ancestors owned property in Aleppo. It is interesting to discover the progenitors of our friends and neighbors, in these distant deserts and ancient chronicles. The *Temukhs* carry up their genealogy through the kings of Heri, etc. to Kahtan or Yoktan, and with a little aid from the Hebrew tables they may "cross the flood" with a bound, and ascend to Adam! This puts to shame the pedigree of the most ancient European nobility. Before taking leave of these old tales I must give one more quotation from Ibn Shiddar. He says, "the town of Kaab was on the Euphrates. There the Israelites dwelt for a long time, and they held to it with such tenacity, that they were nine times expelled before they were finally exterminated." This Kaab was in the province of Kunsarîn, and as we have found the

Zobah, where David overthrew Hadadezer when he went to restore his border on the Euphrates, may not this Kaab be his frontier garrison city, and this be the reason why they clung to it with such tenacity?

On the morning of the 19th, my companions went to the hills on the south of Sphery, to hunt, and I hired a guide and rode to the salt vale—about six miles east of the village. The plain subsides gradually into the "vale," and having always understood that it was a lake, and having seen the setting sun reflected from its polished surface last evening, I supposed of course that we were approaching a fine inland sea. There too, was the shore, a short distance in advance of us, as distinctly marked as that of the ocean; but what was my surprise not to find one drop of water—nothing but a boundless extension of encrusted salt. With strange sensations I left the *shore*, and began to ride over this sea of salt. The water is just ahead of me—on I rode to meet it like a child chasing the rainbow. Presently I saw a large flock of white gazelles about a mile from me, actually standing *in* the water, with their graceful proportions beautifully reflected below. At full speed I attempted to overtake them, but not being partial to the society of strangers, they bounded away over the sea, pausing now and then to gaze at their baffled pursuer. Finally, when I reached an artificial mound which stood in the midst of this tantalizing sea, I was forced to admit that I had been the dupe of an optical illusion more perfect than I had thought possible. On looking back I found myself in the middle of the sea—well I am now prepared to credit any story about mirage, however marvellous. From the top of one of the numerous artificial mounds, I surveyed at leisure this strange vale. A vast expanse of glassy salt, glowing in the burning sun of August—an oppressive, saddening, *dismal* brightness. I have rarely felt such a sadness at heart as when steeped, *drenched* in this flood of glory. The very atmosphere trembled, and *simmered*, and quivered, as if it were molten silver. The excess of brightness was terrible, and the total silence and utter absence of any manifestation of life, were oppressive. It is a vale of utter death, polished and burnished into intolerable and horrid splendor. It is four days' ride in circumference.

In winter this whole region is actually a lake, with its margin as accurately defined as any other, but by August the water has all evaporated, and a crust of white, coarse grained salt, has been deposited over the entire surface. I nowhere saw this crust thicker than half an inch. The quantity, however, depends upon the amount of rain during winter, and it is said, sometimes, and in certain places, to

be several inches thick. Ibn Shehny says that the salt is brought down by two small rivers which enter the vale from the north-east. This, however, needs further investigation. Maundrell found a locality on the border of the lake itself where salt exists in a mineral state. The current opinion in the neighborhood is, that the salt is brought down by the tributary streams, and they urge in confirmation, that when the rains are long and copious, the amount of salt is increased in proportion. After riding some time, I came in sight of the salt gatherers in the neighborhood of Jebbaal. Men, women and children, camels, donkeys and mules, in long lines *floating in glory*, now lifted into the air—now wading through molten silver—now utterly concealed, according to change of position, or the vagaries of this most wonderful mirage. I shall not readily forget the impressions of this day's ramble. Jebbaal is about ten miles north-east of Sphery, and is the great depôt of salt, from whence it is distributed all over northern Syria. The salt gatherers get from 200 to 300 piasters per camel load, but the government, I am told, takes from 50 to 70 piasters tax, on each load. This is a very rigidly enforced monopoly.

I rode over a large camp ground of the Anazy Arabs on the western margin of the *vale*. These Arabs refused to pay a certain tax last winter, and the Pasha of Aleppo surprised them in their camp, took several sheikhs prisoners, and compelled them to purchase their freedom at great expense. This is the reason why they are so troublesome at present—and on this account I could not get to Kunsarîn.

From a large artificial mound not far from the margin of the "vale," I took the following bearings:

Village of Sphery, ...	300	distance 6 miles.
Castle of Sphery, ...	290	" 9 "
Aleppo, ...	305	" 24 "
Tel Araran, ...	320	" 12 "
Tel Nowam, ...	360	" 10 "
Jeble Zaran, ...	50	" unknown.
Jebbaal, ...	62	" 8 miles.
Peak called Jeble Hamimeh, . .	65	" on horizon.
Deir Hâfir, ...	70	" "
Jebbaarin, ...	88	" uncertain.
General centre of the Vale, . . .	130	
Jeble el-Baaz, ...	135	" on horizon.
Direction of Zobah or Zobad, . .	140	" 8 hours.
Wady Amira—and direction of Kunsarîn,	165	" 6 "

The "castle" of Sphery is situated four or five miles south-west of the village, and from it the castle of Aleppo bore 317; Jebbaal, 90; Sphery, 93; Tel Abu Jerrain, from whence the other bearings were taken, 105.

Between Sphery and Abu Jerrain, is a small village called Mellu-hah, built on, and out of the ruins of a considerable town. There are many columns amongst these ruins. The Italian traveller, Peter della Valle—a second Joseph Wolf, in the variety and extent of his wanderings over the East, passed this village in 1617, on his way to Bagdad; but he gives no particulars, and his journey across this interesting desert, is as barren as the desert itself. After following him from Aleppo to the Euphrates we remain as ignorant of this terra incognita as we were before.

The castle of Sphery is on a high volcanic hill, and is merely a cyclopean enclosure, made by piling up the large trap rocks in irregular lines. My guides, who are great hunters, and have wandered over these deserts as far as Kunsarîn, represent the whole country as volcanic, which agrees with Ibn Shehny's statement, that the towns in that region are built of black stone. The soil, however, is fertile, and the country is desert merely because it is overrun by the Arabs. Innumerable flocks of the *white* gazelle pasture on these hills and fertile vales. These, with wild boars, hares, bustards, quails, partridges and woodcocks, are the chief victims of the sporting gentlemen of Aleppo. Our party having joined me at the "castle," produced from their nets some dozen of the red legged partridge, and a few hares—a rather unsuccessful day in their opinion; and when one thinks of a ride of fifty miles, during such a withering wind as this, he sees no reason to question the justness of their estimation. Still, the exercise is healthy and invigorating, and this is an adequate compensation for the time spent, the fatigue endured, the tattered garments and blistered skin.

The volcanic hills appear to rise about 500 feet above the general level of the country, and they are said to abound over all these plains, to the Euphrates. This great volcanic region commences at the sea, not far from Tortosa—spreads over all the Ansairiyeh mountains—constitutes the major part of northern Coele-Syria—stretches by Hams, Hamah, Salemiyeh, Maanah and Kunsarîn, to the Euphrates; and how much beyond, into Mesopotamia, I have not been able to learn. In the vales, and low plains, water can be procured at a moderate depth—at Sphery only a few feet below the surface. Ibrahim Pasha began a noble system of *colonization* in order to restore the ancient cities and villages of Kunsarîn, by settling peasants and parties of Arabs in them—granting them grain, oxen and ploughs, and compelling them to abandon their migratory habits and cultivate the soil. He would have succeeded if he had been allowed to remain master of the country. The present government has been disposed to pursue

the same plan, but with little prospect of success I fear. They lack energy, wisdom, perseverance and patriotism in the subordinates, upon whom the carrying out of the plan must depend. A good government, however, would soon cover the province of Kunsarîn with an industrious and thriving peasantry. In this province resides permanently the singular tribe of Arabs called *Slaîb* or Sulaiyîb. They are the most primitive in their habits of all these dwellers in the desert. They do not mingle with other tribes—are not Moslems, and are reported to have no religion whatever. By many who are well acquainted with them, however, they are believed to be a sort of degenerate Christians. They raise no grain nor flocks, and never eat bread, but live entirely upon the meat of gazelles; and their only clothing is made out of their skins. They are very ingenious in their devices to catch gazelles, but their most successful method is to build long diverging walls in the desert; and at the point of junction, they dig a deep pit. The whole tribe then make a grand hunting circle, and drive the gazelles within the arms of these walls; after which they are easily forced into the pit, and slaughtered in immense numbers. The meat is dried in the scorching wind and burning sun, and laid up for future use very much as the Indians preserve the meat of the buffalo. These Arabs have no domestic animals but the donkey, and in every respect exhibit the lowest form of human society. I made many efforts to become acquainted with some of these semi-savage, semi-Christian Bedouins, but unfortunately failed. On account of the fierce attitude of the powerful Anizey, the Slaîb have not lately ventured out of their desert, even as far as Sphery, though in peaceable times they are often found in Aleppo. Mr. Barker, and other gentlemen who have had much intercourse with them, inform me that they are simple, peaceable denizens of the desert, not given to rob the traveller, or to make hostile incursions upon other tribes. My Arab friends in Sphery assured me that the word Zobah was incorporated into many of the names of these primitive inhabitants of this very ancient province. This, however, needs further examination.

It is now *threshing* time over all this region, and I have been much struck with their *machine*. Five circular iron plates, about a foot in diameter, having sharp iron teeth on the external circumference, are fastened on a cylinder of wood five or six feet long. This cylinder is attached to two *slabs*, like the *runners* of a sled. Upon these a seat is erected over the cylinder, upon which the driver sits. This machine is drawn over the grain by horses or oxen, until the straw is chopped into fine chaff. It is then heaped up in the centre of the

floor, and a fresh supply is thrown down, which in turn is ground into chaff, and so on until the whole crop is finished. The grain is then separated from the chaff by tossing it up in the air during a windy day, of which there are abundance, according to my experience. This chaff is as carefully gathered up as the grain, and serves for provender during the entire dry season of the year. The grain is pulled by the hand, as we pull flax, or cut off at the very ground by a rude sickle, and by this process of threshing, the entire stem is preserved for the cattle; and as there is no hay in Syria, this straw is an indispensable article for every peasant. Of course, the floor is the bare ground in the open field, and the grain is covered with a fine dust or sand, which gives the flower a brownish color, and a *gritty* touch and taste, unless the wheat is washed before going to the mill. This machine is used in no other part of the country, and I suppose it is the sharp threshing instrument *having teeth*, mentioned by Isaiah 41: 15, by which God declared he would make the "worm Jacob" thresh the mountains and make *the hills as chaff*. It differs essentially from the broad *slab* with bits of porous lava fastened in the bottom, which is used in other parts of Syria to grind the straw into chaff.

We returned to Aleppo, which we reached by nine o'clock at night, having rescued a poor boy and his donkey from a company of robbers, who were prowling about seeking prey. As our party were mostly Franks, and well armed, they allowed us to pass, but in a few minutes we heard the cries of the poor lad—and galloping back, the robbers made off, and were soon lost in the surrounding darkness.

To this dull Moslem city our narrative must now return, and amongst the thousand things which might be said of it, and which have actually been said and *sung* a thousand times by fond Arab lords and partial historians, one is at a loss what to select. Almost everything, however, must now be described by parallels of opposition, and the resemblance of contrast. Instead of being surrounded by splendid forests, Aleppo shows long ranges of low, naked hills, burnt and blasted and desolate. Ibn Shehny says that the all-destroying Tartars cut down the forests—"may the graves of their fathers be defiled." Its "sweetest of all waters" which gushed in crystal fountains, in every mosque and market and *medrisy*—in private dwellings, orchards and gardens—the delight and glory of Aleppo—is now dreaded by both natives and foreigners, as the mother of that most odious of blotchers—the Aleppo button. (This journal owes its existence to one of these hideous eruptions which has confined the writer to his room for the last month, and has set him to reviewing his notes to pass

away the dull imprisonment). Instead of 250,000 inhabitants, mentioned by Ibn Shehny and others—"the wealthy, the learned, the polished, the peaceable, the *honest*, faithful, generous and hospitable," —and a long array of magnificent adjectives besides, altogether untranslateable—this city now numbers about threescore thousand in all —a mingled race, abounding in paupers, rogues and ragamuffins. Instead of a mosque for each day in the year, and a medrîsy, or college, for each mosque, they have scarcely one for each day of the month, and the less said about their medrîsies the better. And thus we might extend the contrast between what *is* and what *was* indefinitely, and with the same result. But as this would be, like her deserts, a very barren *extension*, we shall not prosecute it any further.

We must now mention some things positive about Aleppo. Her celebrated castle is a very positive ruin, and a most conspicuous object. Her fortifications, well described by Gibbon, have now fallen to decay, never more, I devoutly trust, to be restored, for I most cordially hate all castles, city walls and gates. The top of this hill would make one of the finest observatories in the world, and I hope it may be converted into some such beneficial purpose in some future day of Syria's prosperity. From the summit one enjoys an admirable view of this city, as it is very lofty and stands nearly in the centre of its wilderness of mosques and houses. It is nearly a mile in circuit, at the base, and rises some 200 feet high; and is a noble specimen of the thousands of artificial mounds which abound in all the plains of Syria. Those who are anxious to know more about them in general, or this one in particular, must consult some of the many authors who have described them at large. Ibn Shehny has exhausted his powers of oriental magniloquence upon the castle, which was built on the summit of this mound. The towers, or minarets of several mosques, were belfries of Christian churches, to every one of which there is a separate history in Ibn Shehny, as there is also for every school, and *nusjed*, and market, and gate, and palace, but such things have an interest only to the citizens of Aleppo, and we shall not translate. The river Quoik rises in the neighborhood of Aintab (in two separate sources as our historian contends, others say but one), and after passing Aleppo, it is lost in a marsh not far from Kunsarîn. It is an insignificant affair, and the water is not fit to drink until it has been filtered, or allowed to *settle* in a tank. The universal opinion is that the *hûbet es Sîneh—Aleppo button*—is produced by some mineral ingredient in the water. I am now paying the penalty of a visit to this city, in a large *button* on the ancle, which from the constant irritation of walking has become large, inflamed and painful. But if not irri-

tated in some such way, it is rarely troublesome, and after running its course for about a year, it disappears of its own accord, and never returns. All kinds of medical treatment hitherto applied to it, only increase the evil, and the safe course is to *let it alone.* It very frequently attacks *natives* on the face, where it always leaves an ugly scar, and sometimes it destroys the eye when it appears near it. I never saw a foreigner who had had it on the face. There are two kinds—*male* and *female*—why so called, is not very clear, certainly not because the one is peculiar to the male and the other to the female sex. The female button however produces a number of separate blotches, the other only one. This curious phenomenon is not confined to Aleppo, nor to the towns along the Quoik. It is found along the Euphrates as far south certainly as Bagdad, and *a button* very similar, if not identical, has lately appeared in many places in Lebanon. It is asserted here that the Druze soldiers who returned from Ibrahim Pasha's army in 1840, brought it with them from Aleppo, and that it has been propagated by infection. This would be a very curious fact if it could be well established.

Ibn Shehny gives the following list of districts or sub-provinces which belonged to the government of Aleppo.

1. Sheizur, "a city and castle on the river Orontes, N. W. of Hamah. 2. Bkas es-Shugar, with a strong castle. 3. El-Kseir, and castle. 4. Deir Kûsh, a castle on the Orontes west of Edlip, built by the crusaders. 5. Harim and Sheikh el-Hadîd, at the N. W. base of Jeble el-Aala. 6. Antakiah, Antioch. 7. Bagras, a castle on the confines of Armenia. 8. Derbesak, with a castle. 9. Hajr Shuglan, with a castle. 10. Er-Rawendan, and with it Tel Haran, the Tower of Russas and Tel Bashir, all famous castles N. W. of Aleppo. Joceline took Tel Haran and destroyed it. 11. Aintab, a beautiful city with a fine castle, and belonging to it Debook and Koores, two celebrated castles. 12. Bakseny, a beautiful city bordering on Armenia, and capital of a rich province. 13. Kerker, in the same region. 14. Kahfa, of which my author merely says it had a castle. 15. El-Bîreh, celebrated for its large castle. 16. Kulaet er-Rûm, in which were the modern Adana, Tarsûs, and Museiseh a Grecian city called by them Mamustra or Mumustia, according to my author, on the Gihon twelve miles from the sea. 17. Menbej. 18. El-Jebûl and el-Bab, N. E. and E. of Aleppo, the author's ancestral district, large and fertile, and the waters of it carry down the salt to the great salt vale. 19. El-Keizein. 20. Arzaz, a very celebrated castle which figures largely in crusader times. The Tartars destroyed it. 21. Sermein, and with it el-Fuah. Maaret Musrîn and Mertah-

wan, famous in early Moslem history. 22. Kefr Tâb, N. W. of Hamah, a very ancient city. 23. Balis, an ancient city S. E. of Aleppo, sometimes called Kunsarîn the second. In this large district was Dufein on the Euphrates, and Russafah an ancient Grecian city in the desert resorted to by the Khalifs to escape the plague, finally destroyed in the thirteenth century, and the inhabitants transferred to Salemiyeh. Khânâsir and Khiyarliny, and the modern Kunsarîn and Kâkâ also belonged to this province, and Allah knows how many more ancient cities, says the author. I could now identify but eleven of these districts, and my list of villages amounts to but 662. There are probably more than 1200 villages still under the government of Aleppo.

Ibn Shiddad has copied from a book written by Kerîm ed-Dowleh, secretary of king Dâhir in the year 609 of the Hegira, the following list of the taxes of Aleppo.

	Drachms.		Drachms.
Tax on water, canals, and tanks,	1,000,000	Soap factories,	10,000
The 'Ashr or Tithes,	600,000	Census of Arabs,	100,000
El-Wekaleh—Agency office,	100,000	Salt magazines,	350,000
Horse, cow and camel market,	380,000	Slaughter houses,	100,000
Exterior and interior fountains,	430,000	—— ——,	100,000
Melon market,	100,000	Potash,	20,000
Grape market,	100,000	——,	100,000
Vegetables,	50,000	Census of Turkomans,	150,000
Tanners,	150,000	30,000 head of sheep,	600,000
———	100,000	A kind of capitation tax,	100,000
Silk dyers,	80,000	Tax on places of pleasure,	600,000
Sheep market,	450,000	Tax on Khan es-Sultan,	80,000
" " of Turkomans,	300,000	Tax on prisons,	60,000
Lumber market,	50,000	——,	50,000
Spice market,	40,000	Greens or grass,	20,000
Smelting furnaces,	5,000	Weighers,	50,000
Bath and oven fuel?	20,000	Iron,	50,000
Auctioneers of Greens?	20,000	Hemp,	50,000
Flower gardens,	50,000	Silk,	80,000
The mint,	100,000	Capitation,	30,000
(Pasture-ground ?)	400,000	Manure,	10,000
Tax on commons,	100,000	—— —— by estimation,	300,000
Wood and coal stores,	20,000		
		Total,	7,755,000

This is a curious exposé of the amount, and the sources of revenue in the early part of the 13th century. Matters and things, and "ways and means" have greatly changed since that day. Most of the sources of revenue were *farmed* out to the highest bidder. This pernicious custom is still practised, greatly to the injury both of the government and the people. These tax-gatherers are necessarily clothed with great power, and they abuse it to lay a heavy additional per centage for their own pockets.

Aleppo was long distinguished for her manufactories of beautiful silk stuffs, but the modern introduction of English goods has completely broken up these looms, and thousands of weavers have been reduced to poverty by the change. The same is true in Damascus. Multitudes of paupers crowd the streets, and the suffering poor do not know how to direct their energies to any other means of procuring subsistence. Aleppo lives upon her caravan trade, and the produce of the surrounding country. Most of the caravans to Bagdad now start from this place rather than Damascus, the route from this latter city being too much molested by the Anazies. These Arabs are a strange set of robbers. One of my acquaintances was recently obliged to come from Bagdad direct to Damascus. He and his companions left all their effects to go by Aleppo, dressed themselves exactly like Bedouins, and, on swift dromedaries, struck through the desert. On the morning of the third day they saw, afar off, the tents of a large encampment, and made boldly for it. The Arabs saw them, but supposed it was one of their own marauding companies returning, nor were they undeceived until our friends were actually within the camp, at the sheikh's door. The Arabs then began to quarrel amongst themselves because they had not gone out and robbed them. They finally brought the case before the câdi of their tribe, and this respectable judge decided, that as the strangers had deceived them by wearing their clothes, until they got into the camp, it was lawful still to plunder them. However, the better class rose against this decision, and would not allow their tribe to be disgraced by plundering guests who had actually reached their tents. If they had been seized only a short distance outside, it would have been lawful, and very honorable to have stripped them of everything they had, and left them to perish on the desert; but now they must be treated as friends, and conducted in safety. And this was actually done, and a guide was given them across the desert to the neighborhood of Damascus. These roving gentry have lately moved south of the line from Aleppo to Bagdad, and hence the northern route is the safest. Still the caravans are often attacked, even those that go by the way of Diarbekir, and the north, to Mosul.

The gardens of Aleppo produce excellent fruits, vegetables, and melons, quite sufficient for the consumption of the city. The low hills on the east of the walls are covered with pistachio orchards. And from time out of mind, this is the only locality where this nut has been extensively grown. It looks like the terebinth, and is believed by many to be a species of that tree. The houses of Aleppo are very substantial and spacious. Most of them are vaulted, which makes them

cool in summer and dry in winter; but many of them are falling to decay, and rents are low. The city has not recovered from the earthquake of 1822, and the shattered walls have not all been repaired. The gates are kept by a guard, but one can ride over the prostrate walls in different places. Many of the Europeans and native Christians have built houses in a suburb called Kittab, since 1822, for greater security. Whether Aleppo is to rise out of her present depressed condition, depends upon the route which a reviving commerce shall find or make for itself. In the adjustments which modern trade and travel will surely make, Aleppo will either be restored to her former wealth, or utterly annihilated. Her internal resources are almost nothing, and she does not possess a single natural advantage for meeting the exigencies of modern enterprise. She is the pet daughter of Mohammedanism, and lives by the old regime. When the slow and silent step of the sponge-footed camel shall be superceded by the whirling car, and the whizzing engine, the need of a great city in a dry, stony desert, a couple of *car*-hours from the sea, will probably not be felt. Caravans, the very life-blood of Aleppo, will disappear from Syria, and with them this city will, not unlikely, sink out of sight. It has neither wood, nor coal, nor water, nor any one element to fit it to become a busy, bustling modern town. During the Ottoman dynasty, however, it will continue to be the grand radiating centre for all northern Syria.

In a country abounding with ancient ruins, Aleppo can show no traces of a high antiquity. Near the Antioch gate there is a portion of a triumphal arch with a Cufic inscription upon it; and on the wall are the remains of an old church with short, ill-shaped columns of basalt. On a block of the same, are a few hieroglyphic figures, too much effaced to be copied. The south-east corner of the wall itself is probably of Roman work, though tradition ascribes it to the Phenicians, in the palmy days of their power and commerce. On a large stone in the wall, at the Bab Nusr, is an inscription. The stone is a fragment, and may have belonged to a temple dedicated to Artemis, the Astarte of the Phenicians and Syrians generally, according to some authors. But to me it appears that the abominable licentiousness said to have constituted much of the worship of Astarte, corresponds better with the rites of Venus, than with the chaste Diana. It is curious to see how a certain superstitious veneration lingers about this old stone. All classes of Aleppines, and particularly Moslems, as they pass in and out of Bab Nusr, rub their fingers over these Greek letters, and then kiss them, to extract the mystical virtue, or to draw down the blessing of the beautiful Artemis. Although the rock is very hard, yet by this process long continued, the inscription has been

nearly rubbed out, and is scarcely legible. Some of the gate-ways, and the entrances to some of the mosques, show splendid specimens of Saracenic architecture. The Tartars have also left the impress of their barbarous rule in huge old Khans, now generally in ruins. I visited one large mosque whose portico, 150 feet long, was supported by a double row of handsome Grecian columns, the ruins of ancient Boerhea. These columns are elegant shafts of a yellow semi-crystalline lime rock, found in the neighborhood. The entablatures are entirely Saracenic, very rich and beautiful. In this porch I found one of the "medrîsehs" so much boasted of by Ibn Shiddad, a ruin too, I suppose; at any rate it was a sorry collection of boys trembling under the *corbadge* of a fierce looking sheikh. He was in the act of inculcating a difficult lesson with his terrible weapon, applied to the extremities most distant from the "seat of reason," thus—the feet of a stout lad were entangled in the complexities of a cord attached to a pole, which, being then raised upon the shoulders of two of his companions, reversed the natural position of the disciple, and upon the *soles* thus exalted, the pedagogue was addressing his *corbadge* discipline with all his strength. Our intercessions in behalf of the writhing victim were unavailing, and the bastinado ceased only with the strength of the zealous master. I have witnessed this mode of teaching "the young idea how to shoot," in several other "medrîsehs" of Syria.

The rock and marl strata around Aleppo have in many places been tilted up and dislocated by the obtrusion of volcanic dykes, some of which even run under the city—an unsatisfactory basis for one's habitation. And Aleppo has actually had her full share of calamities from frequent and dreadful earthquakes, both in ancient and modern times. It was totally overthrown by one of these executors of Divine wrath in 1169, and it also suffered severely in all the similar disasters which so often destroyed its great neighbor Antioch. And in 1822, it suffered more than any other city in Syria by the earthquake of that year. Joseph Wolf participated in the dangers, and has given a description of that fearful visitation. Not a year passes without repeated shocks of greater or less violence, and it requires considerable experience before strangers become reconciled to these "nervous affections" of "mother earth."

ARTICLE VI.

THE ORATIONS OF THUCYDIDES.

An Extract from "The Life, Work and Times of Thucydides," by Wm. Roscher, Ph. D., Göttingen. Translated from the German by John W. Mears, A. M., Student in Philosophy and the Arts at Yale College.

Introductory Remarks.

[THE subjoined paragraphs are the results of the labors of a German scholar upon one of the most difficult subjects in Greek literature. The orations of the master historian are not only famous for their intricate and perplexing constructions—they also suggest serious questions as to the veracity and faithfulness of Thucydides; whether, too, he was guided by any settled, profound purpose in his management of this part of the history, or whether the *Thucydidean Oration* is the product of a whimsical and profitless eccentricity. These latter questions employed the energies of Dr. Roscher in that chapter of his work which we now lay before the American scholar; and we cannot but hope it will prove acceptable to such as have encountered the difficulty it discusses and seeks to remove.

We do not vouch for the correctness of all our author's conclusions —it might be presumptuous for us to sit in judgment upon them. Indeed, it is not our whole purpose to publish received elucidations of the obscurities of an ancient model; we wish to put down upon an American page for the inspection of American students, an example of the refinement and closeness of observation, the thoroughness and accuracy of investigation, the sagacity of deduction and more than all perhaps, the free play—the ample range of vision—up and down the subject of study until it is apprehended in its unity, which we and they seek to attain through the medium of classical studies. And yet from the very prominence of these qualities throughout our extract, we feel safe in affirming, that the views of the author are worthy of serious consideration. We are busying ourselves with no cunningly-devised fables, with no plausible but groundless speculations. The man who had never opened Thucydides, would feel secure in yielding to some of his conclusions: they are so palpably just; and the man who *has* studied the philosopher-historian can at least discern, that only after an investigation equally thorough and extensive with that

of Dr. Roscher, could most of his conclusions be effectively assailed; so deep are their foundations.

As to the translation—we have seldom deviated from what we should call literalness, except when compelled to it by the usual differences of idiom and structure. The unnecessary faithlessness of translations generally, has long been a matter of our observation and regret, and while we have sought to present our author's ideas in a true English garb, we have been no less anxious to preserve their exact figure and proportion as they appear in the original dress.—Tr.]

Thucydides is now in possession of a rich store of external facts—that is, of such facts as had fallen under the notice of his eye and ear; popular assemblies and senatorial decrees, sieges and battles. An historical mechanic would have arranged these notices, and published them. Not so the artist. Deep in his thought, began now the *decomposition* and *assimilation* of this material, preparatory to its transformation into a work of art—a work of art peculiar to Thucydides. For, a bare protocol of events is no more history, than the sketch of a lifeless countenance would be a portrait.

The particular work of the historian in this process, is two-fold. He must first penetrate from the outward facts, to the something that is within. This internal is often denoted in our days by the name of historical ideas or principles. To the greater number, there is something speculative, and so unhistorical, or if you please, hyperhistorical, concealed under this title. But in truth, this very phrase has been employed by veritable—by excellent historians. They understand by it, *the spiritual motives*, i. e. the thoughts, the resolves, the feelings, of the chief characters and their dependents, that lie at the foundation of the external facts. These spiritual motives that decide *every individual for himself*, but that come to historical import because they are common to *many*—these motives are not learned simply by learning the facts. Practical men speak sparingly of what goes on in their thoughts; if they *do* speak of it, then least of all, may the historian receive it without investigation. Simple as the *results* may appear, on the contrary the work of the historian in this process is most involved and intricate. Such a many-sidedness of the spirit is here presupposed, that he must think and feel every character that appears in his history. If now the historian meets with outward acts, he inquires: "What must be *my* state of mind if I should purpose such deeds?" Thus, from the action, he learns the spirit of the actor. *Διενοεῖτο οὕτως ὁ Τισσαφέρνης, ὅσα γε ἀπὸ τῶν ποιουμένων ἦν εἰκάσαι*, (8. 46). The great number of such combinations decides for particular cases.

In the next place, the historian must separate the important from the unimportant, through his whole store of material. Importance, however, is a relative idea, which is determined by the object of the work. He must make distinctions between principals and subordinates; he must form threads along which to arrange the events, in groups. Such distinctions, however, such threads and groups do not really exist; they must originate in the historian's thought. These are the two points of view from which the work of Thucydides will now be regarded.

§ 1. *Great number of the Speeches of Thucydides.*

The first object that presents itself in this discussion, are the speeches of Thucydides. They appear to the composer himself, important enough to receive mention in his preface, (1. 22). In quantity only, they make a very important part of the work; of 900 chapters, more than 180, that is more than a fifth, consist in direct formal addresses. Trogus Pompeius is said to have condemned this frequent interweaving of speeches; for his time, indeed, and for his object, the like would no more have been appropriate!

The age of Thucydides, however, was the first period of the political eloquence of Athens, and Pericles and Antiphon, afterwards too, Alcibiades, Critias and Theramenes, were regarded as its masters. Pericles spoke but seldom before the people, and only upon the weightiest occasions. That he left no written speech behind him, is a sufficient proof how, entirely without self-conceit, they were directed to the practical result alone. Notwithstanding he thus individualized for the particular circumstance, Pericles knew how to connect every one of his words to the widest principles of his policy, and to the profoundest views of life in general. In this chiefly consists his majesty, that procured for him the title of the Olympian. Without flattery, he knew how to lift the people to his own elevation; his words, says Eupolis, left a sting behind in the soul of the hearer. His external appearance, too, ever severe, ever great and sublime; his voice smooth and even; his dress never discomposed by violent action; his mien itself unchanging, never relaxed to a smile. It was an eloquence that may have been related to that of Demosthenes, just as the art of Phidias was related to that of Lysippus, as far down as the author of Laocoon and the Gladiator. An exact balance was observed between the word and the action. Already, too, as is usual, the theory was about uniting itself to the perfected practice; and with the first Sophists of Sicily, commenced a long series of rhetoricians, which, sus-

tained through the following century by the first orators, was at last concluded by Aristotle.

We may remember further, that the *drama* of the Greeks was now in the height of its bloom; indeed that, for a time at least, it had well-nigh supplanted the other branches of poetry in Attica and Sicily. Plato has already remarked, how closely the oration is related to the drama. And in truth, if the external difference between the drama and the lyric and epic departments, consists mainly in this, that in it the characters all act for themselves, there is *no way* for history to become more dramatic, than by allowing its heroes to speak. How forcibly the works of Sophocles affected the whole arrangement of Herodotus; how in a thousand ways Xenophon is concerned with Euripides and the later comedy, I must reserve to develop in another place. Thucydides has borrowed nothing more from the drama than the life and oratorical richness of his representation. If hence we ascribe to him a dramatic disposition in particular, a division into acts and the like, as Ulrici has attempted; I can only consider it a piece of that aesthetic trifling against which Niebuhr was so urgent. Even in the conversations of the Sophists, whence indeed, the Socratic method of instruction shortly arose, we may perceive this dramatic tendency of the age. That some *universal* trait of the Hellenic character was the cause of this, may be shown from Homer, who is already much more dramatic and who gives far more in his heroes' direct speeches than the later epics.

Thucydides generally arranges two formal addresses in juxtaposition. In two places of our author's work, this becomes the dialogue, (3. 112, 5. 85). Where he only suffers oblique addresses to be given, a reason is always at hand. For example, there are many places where, if every one were to speak directly, a great multitude of addresses would become necessary—such a multitude, that the simple circumstance lying at the bottom, would be entirely suppressed. Why *not any* direct addresses occur in the eighth book, may be explained from the fact that the finish of the book is wanting, since death interrupted the historian in his task. From other grounds, it will hereafter become more probable, that the speeches received their present shape only at the last elaboration of the work. There are other places besides, where oblique addresses appear; the contents of these, and the events to which they allude, it is the historian's purpose to draw rather into the background. This is an important accessory to that marvellous gradation of color (*abstufung des colorits*) that is peculiar to Thucydides. In his introduction, for instance, some speeches of Themistocles are given—all oblique, because they only belong to the

introduction. In the work itself, Thucydides does not commonly describe the character of his heroes; they must characterize themselves and that by their speeches. In this case too, the introduction follows the opposite course, (see 1. 91, 138).

§ 2. *Preliminary Inquiries upon the Relation of the Speeches of Thucydides, to those really delivered.*

Did Thucydides design to report faithfully, as far as he could, the speeches that were really delivered? This is the first question. Although the scholiast answers it in the affirmative, it must be negatived for *internal* reasons. K. O. Müller has already discovered, that the speeches often stand in a mutual relation, that never could have obtained. The speech of the Corinthians (1. 120 sq.), answers in a manner to that of Archidamus in the Spartan assembly, and to that of Pericles at Athens, though the Corinthians had heard neither of them. How could the Corcyreans, when they were anxious to become the allies of Athens, in reality have enlarged so much upon their former neutrality, or affirmed that Athens owed them just nothing for it? (1. 32). Moreover, since the Athenians desired still to maintain the peace, they would never have dared to preach up the right of the stronger with such inconsiderateness as in 1. 76. In other cases, on the contrary, they were always provided with some proof of right, as appears from 3. 11. Much more, Thucydides states expressly that the real ground of the war—the growing power of Athens—had previously appeared least of all in the speeches, (1. 23). But with the speeches as reported in the first book, this is not the case. The policy of the king Archidamus was chiefly aimed at creating discord in Athens itself, (2. 20). His speech, however, in which he so fully discusses the means of carrying on the war, knows nothing of it. Finally, when Pericles, in the funeral oration that depicts the magnificence of the Periclean age, breaks out into the complaint, that it is so difficult to gain general belief in this representation; in the mouth of Pericles it is almost without meaning—simply because his actual hearers had that magnificence before their eyes, and were personally interested in it.

Fortunately we possess *external testimony* besides. In Aristotle's Rhetoric (1, 7. 3, 10), a sentence is quoted from the true funeral oration of Pericles. And this can be compared with the same speech as it stands in Thucydides. It runs thus: *τὴν νεότητα ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἀνηρῆσθαι, ὥσπερ τὸ ἔαρ ἐκ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ εἰ ἐξαιρεθείη.* Of this thought, there is no trace to be found in Thucydides; I could scarcely

name a place where it might be introduced. We may learn from this, that Thucydides disdained a verbal transcript, even where it was possible. If Aristotle could have received that expression, how much sooner the contemporary Thucydides? But more. Since Thucydides himself was sick of the plague (2. 48), and since this plague broke out in Athens immediately after the funeral oration, it is in some degree probable, that he was just at that time in Athens. The plan of writing the history of the Peloponnesian war, he had conceived at its beginning, (1. 1). Should he then have stayed at home from the funeral oration of Pericles? It is well known, indeed, that Pericles left no written discourses; that Quinctilian, especially, declared those extracts in his time to be spurious. Spengel infers from this, that Aristotle received this expression only by a tradition of the rhetoricians. That may all be true. But if Thucydides had intended to bring his speeches as near to those really delivered as possible, he would necessarily have received and incorporated this expression, just as much as it was in the mouths of the reading public. Besides, Pericles was accustomed to prepare himself for speaking always with extreme care; indeed he frequently wrote off the sketch of the discourse beforehand. How easily then, might Thucydides have obtained such a sketch just once for inspection! But there is still another consideration remaining. Weber maintains that the notices of Aristotle have no reference to the funeral oration in the first year of the Peloponnesian war, but to another delivered by Pericles after the conquest of Samos. The expression *νεότητα* only suits the later speech. This *proof* of Mr. W. I must candidly confess I do not understand. The position itself, however, is contradicted by Plato's Menexenus, which was probably written with reference to Thucydides, and consequently must understand by the funeral oration of Pericles, that given by Thucydides. So then it is to be supposed, that Aristotle intended by the funeral oration, *κατ' ἐξοχὴν* this second, not the Samian. This idea Dahlmann, among others, has adopted without scruple.

Hence too, we derive a still stronger support for my whole opinion. If antiquity, of Plato's time, declared the nominal orations of Pericles to be spurious, so it found *in Thucydides no real orations* of Pericles.

Now the inquiry arises in the second place, Was the content of the Thucydidean orations, some personal view of Thucydides—some assertion or opinion. Not entirely so. For among other things, it surely was not the real opinion of Thucydides, if he makes the Corinthian ambassadors at Athens maintain that, for this reason only had Cor-

cyra remained neutral, because she alone desired to act unjustly—to escape all observance of her shameful deeds, (1. 37). The sketch of their former conduct, which the same Corinthians draw (1. 39), stands almost in direct contradiction to the narration of Thucydides himself, (1. 28). In the speech of Euphemus at Camarina, every one will admit, that the real designs of the Athenians are concealed, (6. 82 sq.). My position, however, hardly needs a further induction of evidence, since now, in the speeches that have a mutual correspondence—and here belong the greater number—while, for the most part, the subject is only variously regarded from various points of view, yet many particulars are expressly affirmed in the one speech that are expressly denied in the other.

§ 3. *True Relation of the Speeches of Thucydides to those really delivered.*

In his preface, Thucydides declares, that with all possible exactness he has retained the *ξύμπασα γνώμη* of the real speeches; but that besides, he has put into every one's mouth, what may have appeared *τὰ δέοντα μάλιστα* for the circumstances of each occasion, (1. 22). In the words that follow, where he discloses his manner of treating the facts, it is evidently a different method from that pursued towards the speeches. He secured for those a severer exactness.

We are to regard the speeches of Thucydides as his special means of tracing back the visible facts to the internal moving causes. No one better understood the art of thinking or feeling every one of his characters. From an Athenian, he can become Archidamus and Hermocrates; from a partaker of the spirit of Pericles, he became Alcibiades; from a polished Optimate, he became Athenagoras and Cleon. He can doff all his habits and relationships—the historian, the artist alone, he cannot resign .... What proper view of this can we attain?

A. Most of the speeches, Thucydides puts into the mouth of his *chief characters*. The words really spoken, could have served the historian only as outward facts. In *his own* speeches, however, where, at the same time, the interior of the characters is to be disclosed, Thucydides must comprehend the whole life of every person. He must have looked through his past and even his future, so as to be able, from these sources, to complete the sketch of his character. Thus what lay behind and before the period of the address, was collected into it. The *ξύμπασα γνώμη*, the main design of the discussion itself, needed not meanwhile to be laid aside—the speech actually delivered, was no less a result of the speaker's character. I cannot help noticing, in this connection, a point of superiority peculiar to Thucydides. There

are certain judgments that historians are in the fashion of giving, among which belong those that I might call *hypothetical judgments*. Thus it is maintained: if instead of the fact *a*, the fact *b* had taken place, then not *c*, but *d* would have followed. The great fault of such judgments is, that they are never reliable; indeed, that they are digressions into a province, totally disproportioned to the historian's standards of measurement. How does Thucydides act in such a case? With *very* few exceptions, he confines this hypothetical judgment to the speeches. There, however, it is perfectly appropriate. There, it can only declare the calculations of the speaker, the expectations of the hearers—a matter which is often mentioned in the direct narration of Thucydides. Before the deed, it is a matter of interest whether anything else may happen; afterwards, it is useless speculation.

B. But at the same time, Thucydides well understood, that everything is not attained with the character of the principal actors. These, by themselves, make no history. It is only when the historian has characterized the *adherents* who connect themselves with the chief personage, that he may presume he has interpreted the facts by their spiritual causes. Hence Thucydides' speeches are not only for the orator himself, but also for his audience's character. Where he paints Pericles, he paints, too, the Periclean age. With Alcibiades, that peculiar party of the young Athens is represented, that afterwards occasioned the tyrannical and aristocratical movements; with Nicias, the remnant of Pericles' Athens, whose age was now past, whose spirit was now flown. Where Archidamus speaks, we recognize at once the Old-Doric party, that resisted the innovations even of the Doric spirit of the age. A few speeches rise from the limited sphere of Greek history to the universality of general history. Thus, in the struggle between the Thebans and Plateans, the case of the old right against the new is tried; and in the transactions at Melos, the ever-recurring dispute of the oppressor against the oppressed is argued out.

And we may learn the great, the truly Hellenic art of Thucydides particularly in this: that, without the least affectation, he has connected all this to whatever circumstance at the time commanded the attention. A reader not thinking of history, might well imagine that it was simply a series of diplomatic or "demegoric" transactions of a high order, that he had before him.

To make these two points clear, I choose now the speeches of Cleon and Diodotus, from the third book. With a delineation of the character of that remarkable demagogue, they unite a portraiture of the people that could endure him. My choice has been decided in this direc-

tion, because we may here corroborate the testimony of Thucydides, almost line for line, from Aristophanes. [See *The Knights.*]

We behold, in Cleon, a man whose energy is thoughtless precipitation, whose courage is only passion joined with ignorance and brutality, (42 init.). In his view stupidity, if it is only determined, must be most suitable for managing the concerns of State, (37 fin.). Unconcerned about the future, he embraces the present only in his view, (39, 44). Averse to all solid counsel (42 init.), for proofs he only gives calumnies, to intimidate his hearers as well as his enemies, (42). His conclusions are deficient in nothing so much as stringency; they prove too much, and, indeed, by taking away all ground from the adversary, weaken their own force, (37 fin. 38 init.). At the same time he understands, admirably well, the art of linking a compliment to every censure passed upon the people (37 init.), and the art of merging his own interests with those of the people, by making a common cause with them, (37 fin.). Conscious of his own corruption, he speaks, at every opportunity, of the bribery of others, (38, 40). Full of envy towards the other statesmen (38 init.), he seeks, by low invective, especially to degrade the art of the polished rhetorician, (40 init.). He perfectly understands how to judge correctly of the people, (38). But if he sometimes is inclined to desire the true inheritance of Pericles' power (37 fin.), yet, on the whole, he is merely a flatterer of the people, knowing nothing higher than their caprice (37 extr.), and therefore, too, as it mostly turns out, is properly despised by his master, (39 conf. 4. 25). Cleon, however, is only fearful to the allies, not to the enemies of Athens; yet in spite of all this, his speech evinces much strength of character and soundness of judgment, as indeed we could not but expect, in the successor of Pericles.

Not less clearly than his personal character, is the demagogue's relation to *the people*—consequently the true foundation of his influence —exhibited. In this speech, the people are seen to be credulous of the past and of the future; slaves to the remarkable, and despisers of the common and the secure; with idle egotism dispensing their favor [as an audience] not from respect [to the speaker] but from a love of controversy; inquisitive on all topics but the really useful; eager for change, without rightly understanding their present institutions, (38). With all this, the Athenians had high resolves, and aimed at nothing less than to play the honest man and observe a safer moderation, (40). In spite of their despotic disposition, this unwieldy mass was ill qualified to rule over others, (37). With all its credulity, it was unaccustomed to put confidence in the open and honest counsellor, and the good statesman himself was forced to crooked ways, (43). The natu-

ral consequence was, that even the demagogues could not enjoy their good fortune securely; did their counsel fail, they alone must suffer for it, (43). In short, it was a people to which Cleon was suitably connected.

This picture receives its historical finish from this circumstance, that in the speech of Diodotus, not only the better state that had gone before is delineated, but moreover the worse that was to arise after it, (42). All this we see developed in two speeches, that have for their express object the fate of the conquered Mityleneans; Cleon would have them all put to death; Diodotus, only the ringleaders. And these speeches are by no means the richest in thought of any in Thucydides.[1]

This characteristic tendency of the speeches is in a high degree strengthened by the variety of their language. The Scholiast, already, has observed that Thucydides uses the boldest figures in the mouth of Alcibiades, (6. 18). How proud and great is the language of Pericles—how mild and convincing that of Nicias—how thoughtful, and grave that of Archidamus! With what a simple and touching view [of their subject] discourse the Plateans, with what craft and sophistry the Thebans! How gloomy and cruel are the discussions at Melos!

C. Thucydides is now in a position to bring his *facts into connection*, and to arrange them accordingly. This, too, he has done in the speeches: very naturally, since the speeches had arisen immediately before, from the action of the historian's mind upon the same facts (*Verarbeitung derselben facta*). Here, principally, he labored to give a transparent clearness to his history, so that in every part where it was possible, one might discern the whole work in miniature. It is for this purpose that the more important speeches are made to contain so many retrospections and so many predictions—the latter, frequently, without the clear consciousness of the speaker. Thus, for example, in the first speech of Archidamus, we find not only the present relation of the Lacedemonian resources to those of the Athenians unfolded, but, in like manner, the springs of action that had thus far decided the course of Lacedemon; and finally, the course of the impending war, its continuance, and the road to victory. In the speech of the Mitylenean at Olympia, the secret progress of the Athenian *hegemony* is disclosed to us; but at the same time it is shown where Athens is most vulnerable, and from what causes its fall will one day result, (3. 9). In Hermocrates' speech at Gela, the whole condition of Sicily before

[1] I do not deem it unlikely that Parrhasius, in his celebrated painting of the many-headed Demus, had this delineation of Thucydides before his eyes.

the struggle, its relations to Athens and the character and final issue of the impending war, are clearly and distinctly developed. This appears quite remarkably in the last speech but one of Nicias, (7. 61 sq.). It is here especially significant that in animating the Athenians, where the opposite consequences of victory and defeat are described, the latter alternative comes out so decidedly, (61). Next, the approaching contest and the Athenian armament are depicted, though just as if this latter were justified rather by necessity, and not as if suggested by prudent forecast, (62). But at the close, a brief yet penetrating glance is thrown upon all the past and future of Athens, (63, 64). In the brief address of Brasidas, too (2. 87), how admirably the essential character of the war is depicted in a general way. Only one must weigh every word.

I cannot forbear exhibiting the same feature more at large, in two other speeches, short and easy of survey. First in 5. 69. Here we have reported in oblique narration, the language which the generals of the different forces used to encourage their soldiers before the battle of Mantinea. On this occasion the Mantineans are told, that victory will make them free, defeat reduce them again to servitude; the Argives, that now or never may their former superiority be regained; the Athenians, that only by a victory on land, will they maintain their authority on land. The Lacedemonians at last—and this is the *keystone* of the whole—are stimulated with the hope of victory to the victory itself. I choose again, 6. 68, a speech of Nicias to the Athenians, just before their first general engagement with the Syracusans. Here, to rouse the spirit of his men, the general appeals to the greatness of their armament, and to the inexperience of the foe, that must baffle his boldness and his energy. Here the question forces itself, unbidden, upon the reader's mind. But how now if that armament is reduced by the sword, by hunger, by fatigue; if this inexperience has become experience by practice? If we are seeking to answer this, the close of the speech at once assumes the character of a dark prediction. "From our fatherland we are far away; and here, there is nothing for us except what we gain for ourselves in battle. We *must* conquer; for in the condition of this territory and in the numerous cavalry of the enemy, any retreat, would bring us certain destruction."

We are now prepared to make use of some *immediate hints of Thucydides himself* upon the relation of his speeches to those really delivered. They are found in the first book, in connection with the speech of the Athenian ambassadors at Sparta (73 sq.). Here the substantial import of the true discourse, the *ξύμπασα γνωμή, precedes*

in a narrative form, (72). And the brief reply of the Spartan Ephor, of little significance for the proper historical development of ideas, serves to control and confirm this narration. Now whatever *else* the Athenian ambassadors say, we may consider as Thucydides' pure material and pure manufacture (*Verarbeitung*). And in the remaining speeches, it is my opinion that the authentic abstracts, as they were presented to Thucydides, will bear pretty much the same relation to his edition of them.

At this point the eighth book presents itself. If it was the decree of Providence to call away our historian before the completion of his great work, we ought yet to congratulate ourselves that he was obliged to leave one book *half* finished. We gain by this means, a most interesting view of the workshop of his art; and if I should at all succeed in placing Thucydides in a clearer light, I am principally indebted to this view [for my success]. The brief and oblique discourses in which this book abounds, are, without exception, such ξύμπασαι γνώμαι, that yet want the last finish. As they now stand, the historian could only have come in possession of them, perhaps have criticised and abridged them. Their proper artistic *re*production and incorporation into his work, had not yet taken place. Similar *draughts* must be presupposed in the case of all the speeches. Whoever would have a conception of these draughts, must be especially recommended to 8. 81. We find here not only a brief, protocol-like account of the contents of the speech, but the motive of the speaker is already intimated, only superficially, however, without much order, without extensive connection with the earlier and later parts of the whole work. Characteristic expressions are introduced with a view to the peculiar reärrangement and preparation (*Verarbeitung*) [of the speech, that is to follow]: for example, the expression that Tissaphernes would not suffer the Athenians to be without support, "even if he must sell his couch to provide it."

§ 4. *Arrangement of the Speeches.*

With very few exceptions the speeches of Thucydides go together *by pairs or groups*. In most cases this is self-evident. It may be less obvious that the speech of the Corinthians (1. 120 sq.) is connected with that of Pericles, (1. 140 sq.). Both speeches announce in the parties there opposed and faithfully carried through in their opposition, the opening of the struggle and their expectations of victory. It may need mention too, that the indirect words of Hermocrates (6. 72) answer to the direct uttered by Nicias, 6. 68. Where two

speeches contradict one another, there Thucydides is never, like most historians, to be found on one side only. The reasonings that he ascribes to both parties, are the strongest that in any similar case could have been employed. Hence it is only seldom that the one discourse is directly contradicted by the other. A more thorough explanation of this peculiarity is not yet in place. But in every case, whoever would read the decision of Thucydides, must gather it for himself from both speeches. All his speeches owe their origin to the effort, by a counter reflection faithfully to mirror back reality. And it is by the same means that reality is represented in its progress—by the opposing strifes of parties.

Of the speeches arranged in pairs, that always stands last, whose object is finally accomplished. Indeed (4. 10 sq.) Demosthenes not only *precedes* Brasidas, but delivers besides a direct oration—the other only an oblique. Where not two, but three speeches go together, then the strongest, i. e. the most successful, is placed in the midst; because of three things, that in the middle always holds the prominent place. The application of this rule is by no means confined to the speeches, but extends to nearly every case where a similar combination of two or three things presents itself for examination. Where more than three things are to be discussed, the most important comes either at the end to make an imposing conclusion (5. 60), or it is placed first, and then at the end repeated, (8. 87). If the alternative is not given directly by the historian himself, but mention is only made that one of his heroes proposed it, then that member always precedes, which contains the expectation of the proposer, (see 1, 87. 139; 7, 8. 15).

A general principle lies at the foundation of these particulars. When Thucydides reports but indirectly the propositions of others, that proposition which *with them* preceded, comes likewise into *his* foreground, because he had thoroughly thought himself into their state of mind. When however he narrates for himself, that always appears to him especially important which afterwards by the result, evinced its greater power. Everybody knows that the majority of the ancient historians, especially that Tacitus maintained the opposite practice. And indeed whoever pursues rhetorical objects, does well, too, to follow a rhetorical order, that saves the most important for the conclusion. Hence we may discern, notwithstanding all his richness in orations, how foreign to our Thucydides are rhetorical objects. Herodotus even, the confessedly *naive* Herodotus, always brings in the strongest, with great parade, at the end.

We may now inquire, *at what places* in his history Thucydides

judged an oration suitable. As unsuitable, he regarded those in which only material relations were to be discussed: for example, the financial and military resources of Athens,[1] or the naval preparations of Syracuse, (7. 36). It is only when for still other reasons a speech seemed necessary, that, to avoid repetition, these statistics are included in the same, (6. 22; 7. 62). Just as little is the speech employed to ascribe motives to plans that were to fail without the least consequence. The latter half of the war with Syracuse especially, is but sparingly interspersed with speeches; nor is it strange if we reflect that the characters and influences that were to decide the course of the war, had been amply discussed in the speeches of the first half.

The chief points of view from which Thucydides regarded the course of the war are the following: The decline of political power in Athens, and as connected with this its decline in the rest of Greece; the ruinous excess of the Athenian spirit of enterprise, which belongs to the Lacedemonians on the contrary, in a proper degree of moderation; and finally, the transfer of dominion by sea and among the allies from Athens to Sparta. When these threads of our work appear with special clearness, there always stands a speech. Thus at the revolt of the first allied State that endeavored to sustain Sparta, (3. 9); at the first sea-fight between Athenians and Lacedemonians, (2. 87); at the first general confederation of Sicily, (4. 59); and finally at the last successful effort to extend the Athenian power, (5. 85). This is particularly to be remarked, where several of these threads are entangled, as it were, into a knot. Thus, upon the punishment of the revolted Mityleneans (3. 36), the debates were continued in two separate councils of the people. Thucydides selects the second to fasten his speeches upon. Evidently with the intention to discuss, besides the chief question, the other also, upon revoking the first decree. Because with this question, he could best exhibit the inner disunion of the Athenian "demagogy," and its relations to the people. For a similar reason, the speeches of Hermocrates and Athenagoras are delivered at Syracuse, *before* there was any *certain* knowledge of the naval expedition of the Athenians, (6. 32). When the Lacedemonians were summoned by the Syracusans to their assistance, then indeed, the embassy of the Syracusans and Corinthians delivered speeches, (6. 88). Yet Thucydides only communicates to us the discourse of Alcibiades, so that besides the nature of the impending war, he may bring out the character of that remarkable man, and the existing relations of Athens. Why of all the funeral orations of the Peloponnesian war Thucydides gives only the first, why too he

[1] 2. 13. Although Pericles really delivered a speech in this connection.

has put the other speeches every one in its place, I leave to the reflection of the reader. Thucydides however pays naturally great regard to the practical importance of the event at any time involved, and to the speech occasioned by that event. Thus, he connects his observations upon the rupture of the peace, which, after his manner, he cannot help expressing in alternate speeches, not to the embassy of Perdiccas (1. 57), nor to that of the Potideans (1. 58), but to that of the Corinthians; because this gave the immediate occasion for the war, and partly because it was actually combatted by the Athenian envoys. Why so little is discoursed *in the seventh book*, is now still more naturally explained; here, there appear very few places where those four threads of our work crossed one another. Another reason is to be sought in the crowded action [*gedrängte Thatenfülle*] of this book, in which the whole war is decided, and which would plainly have suffered dismemberment by too much speaking. The sixth book, which precedes, is the richest of all in speeches; the eighth, had it been completed, would be just as rich. Thus enclosed, the deficiency of speeches in the seventh book would have been completely concealed.

The weightiest occasions of the whole war, Thucydides seeks to set in relief by *trilogies of speeches*. Thus, the war with Sicily is introduced with three speeches (of Nicias, Alcibiades, and Nicias again), by three speeches brought to a close, (7. 61, 66, 69). At the commencement of the whole war, we find again three speeches (of the Corinthians, the Athenians and Archidamus), one for, one against, and one deciding it. From Thucydides' great love of symmetry and tendency even to the style of the refrain, we may expect that at the close of the whole war he would have employed a trilogy again; likely Theramenes for the peace, Cleophon to the contrary, and Lysander with the decision.[1]

§ 5. *Conclusion.*

It has already been observed that Thucydides' orators, often unconsciously, and even contrary to their purpose and their conviction, disclose the motives and the results of their measures. We may see this most beautifully exhibited in the case of Cleon. Less sagacity

[1] The reader can now judge whether it is consistent separately to translate the orations of Thucydides as Melanchthon and Reiske have done. In general, it is a thankless task to give excerpts from Thucydides. One might as well extract a dialogue from Plato, as well make a copperplate of a single figure from one of Raphael's groups.

even he supposes, joined with a sober deference to law, is more beneficial than great intellect with unbridled lawlessness, (3. 37). It is conformable to human nature, to despise the flatterer with all his courtliness, (39). He that hath done another unjustifiable wrong, is his most violent persecutor, and is implacable from very dread, (40). He regards it a prime error of the Athenian body politic, that every one is eager to appear *himself* an orator, and if he fails in this, at any rate to oppose the other orators, (38). What cutting self-irony is contained in these propositions! But there is the refinement of the artist beneath this circumstance.

I liken it to a peculiarity of *Sophocles*, that has been called his tragic irony. It consists in this, that the characters of the piece in their delusion are made to utter ambiguous speeches; to themselves indeed, only the one sense is clear, which *becomes* their presumption, but to the spectator the other too, that predicts their destruction. Thus the speeches of king Oedipus from the beginning throughout, are full of awful truth: the more awful, the less he appears to have a bare presentiment of the truth. By this means the work acquires on the one hand, its highest transparency; on the other hand, the reader or spectator is, by the same arrangement, exalted above the intricacy of a particular moment, and allowed an unobstructed view of the whole from the position of the composer. With the tragedian, there lies in this sad irony of human blindness, something profoundly tragical; with the historian, something truly historical; because it is only by this means that he can show how destruction may impend and yet be unobserved. To Euripides, this irony is but little known; he uses it chiefly in verbal witticisms. With *Aeschylus* it is rarely introduced, but never without powerful, deeply moving effect. But for this, Aeschylus employs another means to make the connection of his trilogies more complete; and this too, to some extent, can be compared with the speeches of Thucydides. It has already been remarked by *Heeren*, that in Aeschylus, an episode is often introduced in the midst of the plot, that helps the progress of the piece but little, that much rather lays open a view which extends far, far beyond the limits of the piece. Thus in Prometheus the *intermezzo* with Io. Here let us remember, that most of the performances of Aeschylus now extant are middle-pieces, and we shall see how beautifully these episodes suggest a retrospect into the first, or an anticipation of the last third of the trilogy; how necessary they are for the whole.

In their historical signification, we can still further compare the speeches of Thucydides with the *Stasima* of the Attic tragedy, or better, with the *Parabases* of Aristophanes. This comparison, how-

ever, is lame in a single point. In the drama the choruses constitute the least dramatic part; in history, on the contrary, the oration chiefly assumes the personal character of the drama. But, just as the choruses secure a point of repose, where all the ideas of character that give the piece its *poetic* life, may be brought to view, so, the orations of Thucydides bring to light the inward motives (the hidden traits of character) that are *historically* the occasion of the facts. Again; just as the poet's own activity (*eigene Thätigkeit*) that has wrought the material gathered from the myths or other sources, appears principally in the choruses; so we have seen too, of the speeches, that in them is most clearly exhibited the artistic creativeness (*künstlerische Schaffen*) of the historian.

Thus there are many points in which the speeches of Thucydides receive light from the contemporary drama. Meanwhile let us beware of regarding the numerous speeches and counter-speeches in Euripides, as of like character with those in Thucydides;—much as the first may have served the rhetorizing historians after Isocrates, and, in like manner, the orators of the later age, as patterns. In general, the speeches of Euripides and the majority of later historians are so manifestly directed to rhetorical objects, so crammed with sentiment and common-place, that with slight alteration, they might be employed in periods and relations of the most opposite character. From such secondary rhetorical objects, Thucydides, however, is perfectly free. Thus he speaks of the last discourse of Nicias, before the issue of the war with Syracuse. He gives us its contents in a few words, and only notices at the end, that Nicias did not fail to speak of wives, and children, and household gods, and did not concern himself, whether such topics might not appear antiquated, (7. 69). Would Theopompus, for example, have here denied himself an extended—an imposing address?

Indeed, the oratory of Thucydides appears to have been a peculiar product of the most flourishing period of Grecian history. With *Herodotus*, we find the oration already wholly employed for the very same objects, only more awkwardly, with less versatility in its management, less free from unhistoric digressions. Thucydides would never have endured the anecdote style and apothegm of 6. 1. The significance, too, of the speeches, for the whole work of Herodotus, is not so great. The oriental kingdoms he describes, instead of a popular assembly, had only a council of princes. Hence, the historian usually employs the dialogue, but just in the same way that Thucydides employs the "demegory." And as to the Grecian world, in the age when Herodotus wrote, its eloquence was yet in the future. For this reason, in

the first half of his work, the place of the oration is partly supplied by the oracles of the gods, and partly by romantic accounts of the royal houses. On the other hand, the speeches of Xenophon often remind us of Thucydides. They are shorter, however; not so diligently elaborated, more similar again, to the dialogue. Politics retire, the military becomes prominent. Already, as a follower of Socrates, Xenophon could have taken little delight in the transactions of the *agora;* the declamations of the Sophists might have been examples of warning to him, besides. Xenophon is not sufficiently impartial to devote the same study to two opposing discourses. Hence his more labored orations, especially in the Cyropedia, usually pass over into the region of universally applicable precept. Thus they disconnect themselves from the fact under consideration, and so far, prepare the way for the later historians, whose works are not properly interwoven, but only outwardly adorned with orations.

Later antiquity has here followed in the footsteps of the pupils of Isocrates. I will only mention Livy. E. g. he makes Hannibal deliver an address immediately before crossing the Alps. In this case Thucydides would probably have discussed the reasons why the war had been brought into Italy, not by sea but over land; he would have cast a glance upon the first Punic war, have drawn the character of Hannibal and his forces, and indicated substantially the course of the war that followed. But what does Livy? He *animates* the Carthaginians to the crossing of the Alps. With very few alterations, the emperors Charles, Otho and Napoleon, when they crossed the Alps, might have delivered the very same address. Livy's speeches are pretty much what he himself would have delivered under similar circumstances. The Thucydidean are by no means such. Livy's strength is in the elegance of his common-place—his expression. In the speech of Hanno (21. 10), we perceive with especial clearness, that the want of acuteness, of individuality for the particular circumstance, and of its pragmatical union with the whole work, which characterize the speeches of Livy, arise from his imperfect knowledge of the subject. It is only with great richness of material, and with complete command over the same, that the oratory of Thucydides can be realized.

ARTICLE VII.

MÜLLER'S CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF SIN.

By Edward Robie, Resident Licentiate, Theol. Seminary, Andover.

[Sin and Redemption—these are the two great facts which engage the attention of the student of Christian Theology. Our views of one of these facts will be according to our views of the other. It is impossible truly to understand the nature of redemption without first understanding the nature of sin. The various departments of Christian doctrine may, indeed, be separately treated of, but together they form an organic body, in which the individual members mutually affect and support each other.

Germany has been distinguished not only for the number of her systems of divinity, but also for the number of monographs, or works on particular doctrines. Among these, few have attracted more notice than Prof. Müller's[1] work on Sin. We propose to give a general sketch of the argument contained in this work. It is entitled, *The Christian Doctrine of Sin*, and is divided into five books. The subject of the first book is, The Reality of Sin, which is subdivided into two parts, (a) The Nature of Sin; (b) Its Guilt. In the second book the author examines several prominent theories which have been given for the explanation of sin. In the third book he gives his own theory, or in other words, his views of the Freedom of the Will. The fourth book is entitled, The Spread of Sin, i. e. its Universality as pertaining to the race, or Original Sin. The subject of the fifth book is, The Increasing Power of Sin in the Development of the Individual.

It is proper in the first place to state briefly the principles which have guided the author in the treatment of his subject. These have been gathered in part from the Introduction and in part from the general method of his argument.

Prof. Müller is decidedly opposed to that school of philosophy which pretends without the aid of premises and empirical observation and by a method of its own to evolve a system of truth. In his view, human thought is never an independent producing, but is a *reproducing* in relation to what actually exists as an object of perception or subject of consciousness. The doctrines of Christian Theology are not pro-

[1] Vid. Biblioth. Sacra, Vol. IV. p. 217 sq.

duced or invented by the activity of the human mind, but are received from a source in which the human mind may be certain of the presence of a Divine power and of eternal truth. Religion is a reality present in the history of the world and in the life of millions. It is a *fact* as real as the existence of an outward world of nature, and as nature did not wait till a science of nature allowed her to exist, so neither have the facts of religion waited for a philosophy to produce them. In unfolding the Christian doctrine of sin, a two-fold purpose may be had in view. Our object may be either to discover the teachings of Christ and the apostles respecting it, or more extensive than this, it may be to exhibit the various theological and philosophical opinions respecting it which have been held both in the church and out of it, and determine their relation to each other and to the doctrine of the New Testament. The first method is possible without the second, but evidently the second is not possible without the first, for a scientific exhibition of doctrines from the sources of Christian consciousness has this double relation to the Holy Scriptures, that on the one side it is a further development of the germs of doctrine contained in them, and on the other side finds in them the measure and criterion of its correctness. And such a criterion is necessary, because the Christian consciousness is liable to be darkened and disturbed by unchristian elements. It is so impressible in its nature, that a skilfully applied logic can give a shape to a doctrine inconsistent with its true character. Every statement of doctrine, to give it validity as an expression of Christian consciousness, needs the corroboration of an outward support, and this is to be found in the revealed word of God.—E. R.]

§ 1. *Nature of Sin.*

In order to overcome an enemy, it is necessary to know something about him. The inquiry, therefore, into the nature of sin is practical in its tendency, and any reluctance to engage in this inquiry because of the painfulness attending it, does not by any means diminish the reality of sin, and, like the cunning of the ostrich, that thinks by thrusting its head into a thicket, to be safe from the pursuit of the hunter, does but deliver us the more certainly into its power.

Sin manifests itself at first as opposition to law. Sin is the transgression of the law (1 John 3: 4). The idea of a moral law requiring absolute obedience, belongs so essentially to human consciousness, that we must doubt of the completeness of human nature in any individual in whom it should be supposed to be wanting. This law, however,

does not have its origin in man. To him it is *given*, and can have its origin only in a Being to whom it is not given, that is, in a Personal God. There is one lawgiver (James 4: 12).

The definition of sin as "transgression of the law," is manifestly only *formal* in its character, the nature of sin it does not determine unless we know already the nature of the law. In order to understand the essential principle of sin, it will be necessary first of all to understand the essential principle of the divine law. Sin appears to us in a variety of forms. The law also is given to us in a variety of precepts, and our inquiry after the principle which binds together the various kinds of sin, or is the common source from which they spring, must begin with the inquiry after the principle which pervades and unites the divine commandments, or, in other words, the essence of moral good.

It is the opinion of not a few that the primary ground of moral right is no other than the will of God itself, (merum arbitrium Dei).[1] This view is to be regarded as the result of a misunderstanding of the idea of freedom, as if the freedom of the will was limited in the same proportion as the subject is determined by motives presented to him by intelligence. On the contrary, we must maintain that an act of the will is so much the more free, the clearer the agent knows *what he wills* and *why he wills*, the more his entire spiritual life is embraced in the act of the will. The law of God which he has given as the rule for the conduct of his creatures, is the expression or manifestation of his own nature, and when the schoolmen (Alexander of Hales, Thomas Aquinas) speak of a *lex eterna*, they do not regard this as existing independently of God, and standing as it were over him, but they place it in the Divine understanding—*mens divina*. Occasionally by these writers the doctrine is advanced that the moral law would not cease to obligate men, *etsi daretur Deum non esse*. Now, while we reject such a doctrine, believing that without a personal God a moral law is not possible, we yet may acknowledge that it contains this truth, that our *moral* consciousness would not at once be destroyed with the loss of our *religious* consciousness. It is an oft-repeated fact, that unbelievers in the existence of a personal God are not able to rid themselves of the warnings of that law which God has written in their consciences. And may we not herein observe a holy and merciful purpose of God, that when man has sundered the bond of communion with his Maker, another bond should remain by which it is possible to

[1] Among the Schoolmen, who held this view, were Duns Scotus and his disciples.

bring the wanderer back again to allegiance to Him from whom he has so wilfully departed?

Yet the advice may be given us not to seek for the inner unity of the moral law, which contains such a variety of precepts, but to rest satisfied with the facts of our moral consciousness and of historical revelation, under the plea that this unity, although present in the Divine Mind, yet cannot be discovered by man. So Augustine, with reference to the doctrine of predestination, regarded the grounds of the decisions of the Divine Will as undiscoverable by the human mind, and Calvin, by his *decretum absolutum*, did not by any means understand arbitrariness on the part of God, but only the incomprehensibleness by man of the wise and holy decrees of God. But certainly it is not merely a scientific interest, it is also a practical interest which prompts our present inquiry. With respect to the nature of the N. T. Dispensation, we read Heb. 10: 16, This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them. We wish to know the fundamental principle from which a holy life developes itself, and penetrates and pervades all the varieties of human relations.

To the scribe who asked our Saviour (Matt. 22: 36—40. Mark 12: 29—31), Which is the great commandment in the law? Jesus said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, with all thy mind, and with all thy strength. This is the great commandment, and the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, and to prevent the conception that these commandments were only the greatest among others which might be added to them, and to lead the inquirer to the knowledge that in them the living unity of all moral commandments is contained, he adds, On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.

In this answer the highest unity seems still to be concealed between a duality of requirements, Love to God and Love to our neighbor. But the manner in which Christ denotes the first of these commandments as the great commandment, shows clearly, that we are to seek in this the uniity of both, and this appears still more clearly if we ask why man, in distinction from all other creatures, should be the object of a love which by no means allows us to regard him as means for our own ends, but recognizes him as having a destination equal to our own. If one points to the unity of the species as the ground of this love, this is indeed the natural basis of the universal love of man, but that is not the ground of its ethical worth and necessity. This is to be found in the fact that the image of God shines in the spiritual nature of man. And if it is our duty to love the Original, it is also our duty

to love the image. Consequently, the second command has the first for its principle, and the external relation of the two tables of the law, one containing our duties to God, the other our duties to man, is elevated to a true unity. God is not only *an* object of love, but is the absolute and all-embracing object of love, so that any other love is holy and imperishable only by being taken up into this. This principle is implied in the requirement of a love to God with all the heart, with all the soul, with all the mind, and with all the strength.

In the Old Testament, the commandment to respect the life of man is based on the image of God in man, (Gen. 9: 6). From this, James derives the exhortation not to curse man, and represents it as a contradiction to praise God as Father, and at the same time to cherish hatred towards men, which are made after the similitude of God, (Jas. 3: 9—11. Love to the Original is not genuine, unless it is preserved in love to the image; and so much the less since we are able to know God only through his revelations, and man is, to some degree, a revelation of God. However, we are never to forget that a revelation of God is only really such to us, when it leads us to Him.

It is not one text alone in which love to God is declared to be the productive principle of all fulfilling of the law, but this truth pervades the New Testament. Christ often represents love to his Father as the soul of his life; e. g. John 14: 31. 15: 10. He requires love to himself, which is identical with love to the Father, (John 14: 9); as the living ground, on the part of his disciples, of the fulfilment of his commandments, (John 14: 15, 21. 15: 10). In like manner, love to God or to Christ, or love generally, is set forth by the apostles as the essential principle of all true virtue. Eph. 3: 17. 4: 15. 1 Cor. 8: 2, 3. 13: 1—7. Rom. 14: 7, 8. 2 Cor. 5: 14, 15. Gal. 2: 20. 1 Tim. 1: 5 1 John 4: 19—21. 5: 1—3. The same thought is expressed, only in another form, when the apostle Paul requires of Christians that all that they do, they do to the glory of God, (1 Cor. 10: 31). The same is taught in the words of Christ to one who, from his youth up, had kept the commandments, (Matt. 19: 16—22). Our Saviour turns his attention away from the individual precepts relating to external acts, to that perfection which embraces every other, and from the abstract idea of goodness to the personal God who alone is good, and to fellowship with him as the only source of holiness and spiritual life for the creature.

Thus, according to the instructions of the Holy Scriptures, we are to regard love to God as the proper essence of whatever is morally good, and every other feeling or action is good only so far as it has its

root in this.[1] This love is not merely gratitude for benefits received, but is adoration of the perfection of the character of God. Yet this perfection, apprehended in its innermost nature, is self-imparting love, (1 John 4: 8, 16); and, in the light of this truth, the opposition into which the historical development of Christian Ethics has frequently brought these two kinds of love, viz. gratitude and adoration, is taken away, and their inseparable unity realized. That love may be the productive principle of a higher life, it must be conscious of its absolute object, God as a person, and of other objects in their relation to him. Only thus is the heavenly magnet found which can sustain the soul not merely for a few moments of enthusiasm, such as perhaps the pantheist may occasionally feel in his adoration of nature, but continually, above that abyss into which the powers of darkness and its own weight would continually draw it.

If, then, the essential principle of the moral law is love to God, the essential principle of sin is estrangement from God, not merely an absence of the love of God, but with this negation of man's true relation to his Creator, there is also a false affirmation. Man cannot withdraw himself from allegiance to God without giving the place of God to some idol. What is this idol? The answer to this question has often been, *the creature*—the love of the creature has been regarded as having taken the place of the love of the Creator. The objects, however, embraced under the term *creature* are very manifold, but one distinction reaches through their whole domain, the distinction between personal and impersonal existences. But since impersonal existences, or things, are only means with reference to personality, if any man loves them instead of God, he loves in them after all only himself, he seeks only his own satisfaction; or, shall we say, that the perverted inclination of the heart, which has taken the place of true love to God, is the love of other persons. that sin is inordinate love to other persons? How were this possible? The bond which unites men in a true and imperishable union is, their common relation to God, (1 John 1: 3. 4: 7, 12, 16); and when men turn away from God, and are estranged from communion with him, they at the same time unfit themselves for the exercise of true love towards one another. In the alliances which the sinner forms with his fellow men, he seeks only his own interest. If any one has the power to deny himself, and to live for the good of others, he has it from God, and lives in God, however undeveloped his knowledge of God may be.

[1] Love to God is the fundamental Idea in Christian Ethics, since the duties which we owe to our fellow-creatures are founded upon their relation to the Creator.

The idol, therefore, which man puts in the place of God can be no other than his own self. He lives for the gratification of himself, and the essential principle of sin, in all the variety of its forms, is *selfishness.*

If this be admitted, then sin is not merely a disorder in the outward sphere of human life, an impurity as it were, which might be removed like the dust from the feet, but is a malady which has penetrated the marrow of our life. There are conditions of life, and with many they form the usual course, in which a person keeps himself free from wild and unrestrained passions, and but seldom performs acts which appear to him as sins. But yet in his soul, "the me, the dark despot rules."

In this connection a question may arise with regard to the moral character of self-love, which has a place in most of our ethical systems. It may be asked, if the selfishness in which the me places himself as the ultimate end of his efforts and actions, be the essence of sin, can any action be morally good in which the subject makes himself the object of it? If there be, must not sin then be regarded as only the excess of that which, in itself, is good, (*nimius amor sui*)? Thus the difference in *kind*, between good and evil, would be resolved in a difference in *degree*, and sanctification would only be a limitation and moderation of a propensity in itself justifiable. It is evident how floating and insecure would be the limits between good and evil, on such a supposition, especially when we consider that only a small part of those who are governed by selfishness are distinctly conscious of this principle of their life, that the greater part sacrifice the requirements of morality to some particular purpose, which can be traced to the ruling principle of selfishness only by the exercise of reflection.

That self-love is of moral obligation, is recognized in the Scriptures, (Matt. 22: 39. James 2: 8). Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself; for though self-love is not expressly commanded, yet it is implied as the measure of our love to others. We feel, too, that others are obligated to obey this precept towards ourselves, and it would be a contradiction to deny ourselves a worth which we are conscious that others should ascribe to us.

What is the ground of the obligation to love ourselves? As all moral obligations towards man rest upon the original obligation towards God, man can be an object of moral obligation towards himself, only because of his relation to God. The moral dignity of the individual rests upon this, that he is made in the image of God, and destined to realize an eternal thought of God. Since sin with its enslaving power has entered the world, the destination of man can be realized only by redemption. Now then, it is no more his natural self, but his self as

redeemed and taken up in communion with God, that man is to regard in his duties towards himself. He must first lose himself, (Matt. 16: 25), give himself up entirely unto God, regard himself as belonging to God, in order that his actions, with regard to himself, may be morally good. It is only in this point of view, that self-love has a rightful place in an ethical system.

That the root of sin is selfishness, is confirmed to us by the Holy Scriptures in various ways. Our Saviour gives testimony of his perfect holiness by saying, that he seeks not his own will, not his own honor, but the will, the honor of his Father, (John 5: 30. 7: 18. 8: 50. cf. Matt. 20: 28. 26: 39). He is set before us for our example, as one who lived not for his own pleasure, but for God, (Rom. 15: 3). The crisis, in regeneration, between the old life under the ruling principle of sin, and the new life produced by the Holy Spirit, is denoted by expressions like these—that the man cease to live unto himself, to seek his own, to love his worldly life, (Rom. 14: 7, 8. 2 Cor. 5: 15. Phil. 2: 3—8, 21. 1 Cor. 10: 24, 33. Luke 14: 26. John 12: 25); in one word, that the power of selfishness be broken. That, however, which needs first of all to be broken, in order that sanctification may begin, must be the essential principle of sin. The same view of the nature of sin is taught us in the picture which the apostle gives us of the development of sin, towards the end of the history of the world, as exhibited in the *Man of sin, who, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God*, (2 Thess. 2: 3, 4). No one can fail to observe a correspondence between this mystery of iniquity and the words of the tempter in the history of the fall: "Ye shall be as gods."

The Christian Fathers and also the Schoolmen generally denote *superbia*, pride, as the beginning of sin. Yet the manner in which they define the term, as a presumptuous desire after independence, as a striving after equality with God, shows that they regard the essential evil to be this, that man has made his own gratification the rule of his life.[1]

The various kinds of sin may be traced to selfishness as their root, and thus a proof be given, that the essential principle of sin has been rightly determined. For example, the lust of the world has its origin in selfishness. Man, as a created and self-conscious being, is necessarily affected by certain impulses or desires, which are indications of his need of something out of himself. Without such impulses, man would be without any necessities, and, like his Creator, would find his rest in himself. Under their influence arises his constant striving to subdue and appropriate to himself the things of the world. And the

[1] Augustinus, De civitate Dei, Lib. xiv. c. 13, 14. Enchir. c. 45.

world is given to man as an object of pursuit, (Gen. 1: 26—28). He is commanded to have dominion over it. But that he may have this dominion over the world, it is necessary that he himself be inwardly free from the world. Man, however, can be free from the world only so far as he finds his resting-place, not in the world, but in a region lying above it, in communion with God. To move the world, Archimedes wanted a place out of it to stand upon. So in a spiritual sense, to overcome the world, man needs to stand on a position out of it, and independent of it. Such a position is found when man acknowledges God as governing and controlling the world and regulates his relation to the world by his relation to God. But when he sunders himself from the Eternal Source of his being, and, disregarding his relation to the Giver of every good gift, seeks for the things of the world only for his own gratification, then their use becomes abuse, and instead of having dominion over nature, he is himself its slave, and language well denotes his desire after it as a *passion.*

Again, the sin of falsehood may be shown to have its origin in selfishness. Truth, in the genuine sense of the word, can be possessed by those alone who live in communion with God, for only thus can they be in harmony with themselves, i. e. with the object for which they were made—a thought expressed in various ways in the Gospel and Epistles of John. Cf. John 18: 37. 1 John 3: 19 with John 8: 47. 1 John 4: 4, 6. It is ever a self-contradiction, although realized in innumerable instances, when a created being, and of course absolutely dependent, makes himself the centre of his life. It is the deepest self-deception, not merely because the satisfaction which is sought for in self-gratification is never found, but because it is not the chief end of man to seek his own satisfaction, but to live in communion with God and in unison with his holy will. And falsehood towards others, and every other form of sin, all come from the utterly wrong principle which man, in his estrangement from God, has made the ruling motive of his life.

§ 2. *The Guilt of Sin.*

In the idea of guilt two distinct points are embraced. The first is, that sin must be ascribed to the man, in whom it is, as its author. The second, that because of sin, man is fallen under condemnation and is unworthy of a share in any other manifestation of God than in his wrath.

The guilt of sin is also to be distinguished from the consciousness of sin. The former is far greater and more extensive than the latter.

Guilt, primarily considered, is something altogether objective, a debt that must be paid because of a previous obligation remaining unpaid, and demands expiation, even though the sinner be not conscious of his relation to the offended majesty of the Divine law. The presence of guilt is by no means dependent upon the acknowledgment of the same in the consciousness of the sinner.

It must be acknowledged, that the difficulties are not small which lie in the way of maintaining, that the causality of sin is to be found in man himself. This independent causality which is involved in the nature of guilt, how is it consistent with the idea of a creature, or with the all-embracing and all-upholding power of God? Since man is the creature of God, he has not only the beginning of his existence from God, but in every moment of his life is absolutely dependent upon God. Since God is everywhere present with his Almighty will, the will of man can work nothing great nor small, nothing useful nor pernicious, without the Divine co-working. A wide cleft between God and the world exists only in the conception of an extremely meagre piety and barren rationalism. In truth, God is so near us, that we cannot move without being moved by him, that we cannot withdraw from his all-pervading power, even if we would. In him we live and move and have our being.

If, then, actions which draw so deep in human life as the contrivance and execution of moral evil, are to be referred to the human will as their original source, how is it possible that they should on that account be regarded as having their ground any the less in the Divine Providence? The doctrine of the omnipresent agency of God and the doctrine of the reality of human guilt are both alike to be maintained. Equal truth belongs to both, and the solution of the problem is to be found in the union of both.

That power in man which originates sin, is the will. But the created will can in no way work without being accompanied by the Divine efficiency. And yet there is a difference in the relation of the Divine co-working to the activity of the human will, and its relation to the activity of the powers of nature. In the former case it *accompanies*, in the latter it *absolutely determines*. To consider the working of the powers of nature as at the same time Divine working is unobjectionable. On the contrary, we are not allowed to think thus with regard to those actions for which we impute guilt to ourselves, even because of this consciousness of guilt. In every sinful action a distinction is to be made between its natural and its moral character. The former consists in the working of those faculties which form as it were the basis, the material, on which the moral character is stamp-

ed. The latter depends upon the principle of selfishness, by which the will has striven to give a direction to those faculties corresponding to this principle. In its moral character, the sinful action is to be ascribed to its subject alone. According to its natural character, the sinful action is done by the Divine co-working. The powers of the human will were not only created by God, but by him they are continually preserved and supported. The omnipresent agency of God does not disdain to join itself to the self-movement of the human will, even in its course of perverseness, and to follow it with its upholding influence. And herein lies a distinction between the Divine co-working in its general sense and the efficacy of Divine grace. The one leaves man considered as a moral being as it finds him, while the other imparts a new principle of holy life. Therefore, however elevating and quieting the consciousness must be to any one to be supported and surrounded by the omnipresent agency of God, yet it were a pernicious error, if one should suppose to have embraced in this feeling the true meaning of religion. The consciousness of that communion with God which is given by justifying faith in Christ, is infinitely higher than the consciousness of a communion with God, in which the wicked share as well as the righteous, and the irrational creation as well as the rational.

There are two fundamental doctrines of Christian theology which unequivocally confirm the testimony of conscience respecting the reality of human guilt, the doctrine of the judgment and of the atonement.

In the judgment, according to the original meaning of *κρίσις*, *separation*, the union which to some extent necessarily exists in this life between the righteous and the wicked, will be taken away, and the essential difference between them which is now in some degree concealed, will then be clearly manifest. Where there is a difference between persons in their relation to God, every other band which may unite them must be transitory. Without doubt there is already in this life a beginning of the separation. They who believe in Christ have everlasting life, have passed from death unto life, have now the fruits of the Spirit, which are joy and peace. On the other hand, he that believeth not, is condemned already. Whosoever committeth sin, is the servant of sin. Punishment begins in the disquietude of the conscience and in the experience that sin is a tyrannical power, and submission to it a bondage. Yet neither the Holy Scriptures, any more than experience, allow us to be deceived as to the fact that the inner peace of the Christian in this life is prevented from pervading his whole being by hindrances independent of his own control, and on the

other hand, it is not true that even in the inner domain of the heart and conscience, punishment always follows immediately upon the commission of sin. Often rather does the sinner escape it, and so much the easier, the more decided he is in the service of sin. The history of the world is the judgment of the world, as it regards nations, but this principle does not admit of an unlimited application to individuals. The good and the bad are here so interwoven that the blessings of Divine grace bestowed upon the former, are not altogether unexperienced by the latter. Not till the end of the history of the world will the disharmony between the inner character and the outward condition be entirely removed, the perpetual continuance of which would be a disorder inconsistent with the sovereignty of God over the world. Opposition to the will of God is possible, but it is not possible for that opposition to maintain itself in a system created and governed by God. To make this fact manifest is the design of punishment. He who has acted sinfully is subjected to a corresponding suffering. By this punitive justice, the majesty of God is attested, upon which rests the authority of law, and the inviolability of which is the safeguard of all his creatures. The assault upon the majesty of God which sin has attempted, can in fact not violate it, for the assault has returned upon the sinner in his punishment. The punishment of the sinner is the expression of the inviolability of the authority of the Divine law.[1]

It seems hardly necessary minutely to apply the argument from the doctrine of judgment to prove that man is guilty for his sin. If sin were a necessary element in the development of human nature, would not God in punishing it condemn his own work? And were there ever so many intermediate members between the creative will of God and the origin of sin, still, if no one of them has a causality independent even in relation to God, must not the guilt of sin be ulti-

[1] A common opinion that the proper design of punishment is the reformation of the criminal arises from confounding punishment with chastisement, *παιδεία*. In Scripture, Divine chastisement is very distinctly referred only to those who have received the renewing grace of God and are become his children (Heb. xii.), and has for its object their sanctification (1 Cor. 3: 11—15. Rev. 3: 19), while the punitive justice of God is upon those who refuse to render to the gospel the obedience of faith, (2 Thess. 1: 8, 9). Both relations appear, (1 Cor. 11: 32). If punishment were a suitable means to effect a renovation of character, what would have been the need of redemption, or rather the reverse, if this renewal is to be obtained by redemption, for what purpose the severe instrument of punishment? or, is the relation of this kind, that when redemption cannot avail to renovate man, he shall be renovated by punishment? Then it would follow that punishment is a more powerful means towards regeneration than redemption.

mately referred to God and thereby a most destructive contradiction be introduced into our consciousness of God? The Divine judgment necessarily presupposes in man the presence of a causality of *relative independency*—of *independency*, for otherwise it could produce nothing which could be an object of Divine judgment, and *relative*, for the very fact that it is subject to Divine judgment shows it to be such.

Still more clearly is the guilt of sin made manifest by the doctrine of the atonement. Were sin merely a calamity, a malady of the race for which man was not guilty, i. e. of which he was not himself the cause, it might, indeed, be regarded as forming a point of transition in the development of the race, and its removal by Divine interference might still be called redemption; but such a deliverance from sin would be very different from the redemption set before us in the gospel. The difference is this, that salvation through Christ is everywhere in the New Testament represented as an operation of Divine grace, as that to which man has no claim, but which is given to him contrary to his deserts. But had God in his plan of the world placed the yoke of sin upon man, we would not say that it were only an act of Divine justice to take it away, for on such a supposition, both justice and mercy would be emptied of their genuine meaning, and the moral earnestness of repentance on the part of man would be an impossibility. The frequent remark that in redemption we have the justification of the ways of God to man, is, therefore, to be received with some allowance, or otherwise, it may lead to an error subversive of the Christian doctrine of grace.

The forgiveness of sins has for its foundation the expiatory sacrifice of the Redeemer. By the commission of sin, man has given himself up to a power from which he cannot free himself without the assistance of the Holy Spirit working within him. He can never in his own strength make the sin which he has committed merely a thing past and gone, but the sin of the past continues to produce itself in the present. But suppose that man were able to sunder the bonds of a sinful nature, and from a certain point in life henceforth by the power of his will to abstain from every sin, yet he could not thereby annihilate his former life of sin, but the past would still be actually present to him as a register of innumerable transgressions. Even though sin when once committed should not continue to set itself forth in the moral condition of the agent, it is not on that account any the less to be imputed to him. It remains upon him as guilt, and he remains responsible for it, and exposed to punishment so long as its guilt is not expiated.

If then man is ever to be restored to communion with God, he needs

an *atonement*, which Christ alone can make, because he alone among men is perfectly holy, and he alone as the incarnate Son of God sustains a relation to humanity which embraces the entire race. Uniting himself by the power of his love in the closest ties with that nature which needed an atonement, he becomes capable as the substitute of man to suffer the death to which on his own account he was not subject. And not till this bond of guilt which connects in the life of the sinner the past with the present, was sundered, could also that other bond, consisting of the power of sin in the heart of him who has committed it, be also taken away. For the Holy Spirit as a principle of new life could not take up his abode in man so long as unexpiated sin lay upon him, so long as Christ by his expiatory death had not entered into his glory, John. 7: 39. Had not sins that were past as well as those that are present, the power to separate from God, did they not lay upon man the necessity to render satisfaction to the violated law, the death of Christ upon the cross would have been superfluous. Hence in that *locus classicus* for the doctrine of atonement, Rom 3: 24 sq., the atoning death of Christ is expressly referred to the προγεγονότα ἁμαρτήματα. To maintain the authority of the Divine government in view of innumerable sins being left unpunished (πάρεσις), it was necessary that God in establishing a new kingdom of love and grace should manifest his justice in the expiatory death of its founder and king. Thus, by the doctrine of the atonement is the truth of our moral consciousness respecting the guilt of sin fully proved. The cross of the Son of God, of him who alone among men was holy, declares more loudly than all the punitive judgments of God, that sins which are done, are still a reality, a power that separates from God, and with good reason did the primitive church acknowledge in the cross of Christ a manifestation of the wrath of God no less than of his love and grace.

ARTICLE VIII.

DAVIDSON'S ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY.

The Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament unfolded, and its points of Coincidence or Disagreement with prevailing Systems indicated. By Samuel Davidson, LL. D. London, 1848, 8vo. pp. 458.

It has been understood for some years, that the author of this work, who is widely known as a theological professor in the Lancashire Independent College near Manchester, and one of the most learned and diligent scholars in Great Britain, has been engaged in the preparation of an elaborate treatise on church polity. Proposing to himself to make an investigation *de novo* of the principles and usages which respect the government of the church, as they are contained in the New Testament, rather than to undertake the defence of any one existing form of ecclesiastical polity, it is not without reason that in view of his known independence the results at which he should arrive have been looked for with no little interest. These results we will now endeavor in a brief compass to state.

The main questions in dispute in respect to church polity, it is well known, resolve themselves into these three:—what is the meaning of ἐκκλησία, or church; in whom is its government primarily vested; and what relation do its officers sustain towards each other in respect to rank and prerogative.

The first of these is fundamental, since upon the solution given to the question, what we are to understand by *church* as used in the New Testament, the decision of the others in no small degree depends. Does it mean, then, a single visible commonwealth, spread in separate communities over the earth, but possessing a common organization, and recognizing a common ruler, as the Greek and Romish churches claim? or is it the aggregation of a number of congregations within a province or country, united under a mutually recognized government, like the church of England or Scotland, or the Presbyterian and Episcopal churches in the United States? or does it simply mean a local assembly of Christians associated together for the observance of

Christian worship and ordinances, or as the Cambridge Platform expresses it and as Congregationalists hold, "a company of saints by calling, united into one body by an holy covenant for the public worship of God, and the mutual edification of one another in the fellowship of the Lord Jesus?"

Of these widely different views Dr. Davidson affirms that the last only is supported by the New Testament. Passing by what is said in the Scriptures of the *church universal*, which, as being composed of all in heaven and on earth who are interested in the blessings of redemption, has no special connection with the question at issue, our author maintains that *a church is a congregation*—not of course of free citizens assembled for political purposes, as the word ἐκκλησία is used by Xenophon, Plato, and very frequently by Thucydides—but, as we learn from the characteristics of the persons composing it, *a congregation of Christian believers* habitually assembling for the worship of God *in one place*. Hence the varying phraseology, to correspond with this, which the New Testament employs, viz. the *church* at Corinth, Ephesus, Smyrna, etc. but the *churches* of Judea, Galatia, Achaia. To meet the strong argument derived from this, it is claimed by those who reject the Congregational view, that the church in large cities, as Jerusalem, Corinth, and Ephesus, must have consisted of *several congregations*, each having its own pastor, and united in one body styled the church, and that the enlargement of such bodies so that they shall include all the congregations belonging to a district, province or country, is an arrangement which depends upon the same principle, and is therefore justifiable on scriptural grounds.

In reply, Dr. Davidson shows in an elaborate argument, covering nearly fifty pages (pp. 70—119), that the churches of Jerusalem, Ephesus and Corinth, were Congregational, not Presbyterian or Prelatic churches—that they each met ordinarily for worship in one place, under the same elders and teachers, and that if they occasionally met in separate bands and smaller bodies, it was for the purpose of social prayer, or for the sake of bringing a larger number under the power of the preached word.

The answer to the second main question of ecclesiastical polity, viz. in whom is the government of the church primarily vested, is closely connected with the decision arrived at, in respect to the nature and constitution of the church itself. If the church is a universal monarchy, then it is not unnatural to suppose that its government may be vested in one sovereign pontiff; if it is a provincial or national confederation of congregations, united under a common government, then the supreme power is probably enough vested in the whole body, or

the representatives deputed to act in their stead; but if, as Congregationalists hold the phrase, *the church*, applied to merely earthly associations, has no meaning according to New Testament usage, except when connected with the *name of the town or city*, in which it meets, as the church in Corinth, the church in Laodicea, then it is and must be self-governed, subject to the jurisdiction and control of no other body, secular or ecclesiastical, but in respect to authority and legislation, complete in itself.

In regard to this question, Dr. D. stands fully upon Congregational ground. "Our investigations regarding the primitive churches," he says (p. 134, 135), "have led to the full conviction, that they were voluntary societies; that they were of a spiritual character, existing for purposes of edification, worship and discipline; that they were not in connection with civil governments, or under their control; that in the time of the apostles there were no provincial or national churches; that there was no external visible unity among them, further than a sisterly relation; that they were not subordinate the one to the other; and that they were complete in themselves."

If each church is complete in itself then it necessarily follows that it is competent to do and enact all things necessary to its well being; that is, to choose its own officers and induct them into office; to cause the sacraments to be administered; to admit and exclude members, in accordance with the laws of Christ, and in furtherance of the great end of church fellowship, for which its members are associated; in a word, to use the strong language of Arnold, that it has "a true *church* government as distinguished from a *clergy* government or from none at all." In respect to all or either of these privileges, it is not dependent on any prelate, church or synod, but is itself inherently vested with the power to perform all the functions requisite to its greatest prosperity. While admitting as we must, that churches were not designed to be isolated bodies, but rather to be closely connected in the bonds of mutual recognition and fellowship, still we are to remember that this is a union of affection and not of authority; and that any attempt to exercise jurisdiction over a church of the Lord Jesus Christ, whether by other churches or their ministers, is an act of usurpation.

As descriptive, therefore, of the relations which churches sustain towards each other in respect to ecclesiastical power, it may be said without hesitation that they are entirely independent. In the 17th century, when the idea of the completeness of individual churches was a novelty, and the term independent, was in danger on the one hand, of being regarded as implying treason or disaffection towards the State, or, on the other, a settled non-intercourse between congre-

gations of believers, there was a reason for attempting to throw off the obnoxious appellation, which, at the present day, does not exist. This is only one out of many cases in which a word once disorganizing and destructive, has become in time eminently conservative. Hooker was afraid two hundred years ago that Independency might be understood to imply the denial of the "coäctive power of the magistrate to compel the church to execute the ordinances of Christ." Who has any such fear now?

In regard to the power of a church to elect its own officers, Dr. D. takes the ground that the four passages on which Congregationalists have been accustomed to rely (Acts 1: 15—26. 6: 1—6. 14: 23. 2 Cor. 8: 18, 19) afford a strong presumption in favor of popular suffrage in the early churches, rather than directly demonstrate its existence, at least so far as the election of elders is concerned. He prefers to rest the argument, first upon the *nature* of a church as a voluntary association and the right of choosing its own officers, which inherently and fundamentally resides in every such body; then, upon the *absence of any express precept* in the New Testament in respect to the mode in which church officers are to be appointed, since, if churches are voluntary associations of believers, such directions would evidently be superfluous; and finally, upon the *general drift* of the notices in the New Testament, which abundantly shows that the popular voice was recognized and treated with respect and deference not only in ordinary cases, but even in the appointment of an apostle, and by men who were invested with infallible authority in ecclesiastical arrangements. The word χειροτονήσαντες (Acts 14: 23), rendered by Hammond and the English version *consecrated* or *ordained*, and to which Beza and the Cambridge Platform give its primary signification, *elected by the suffrages of the people*, Dr. D. thinks should be simply rendered *appointed*, on the ground that in the age of the apostles, the word was used in its secondary sense, in which the idea of suffrage is wholly dropped, and which it is known to have had. Granting, however, that Paul and Barnabas actually chose elders for the churches, there is no evidence, he justly remarks, that they did this without the concurrence or even the previous designation of the brethren; much less can it be shown that the prerogatives exercised by men divinely inspired, may be rightfully claimed by modern prelates or ecclesiastical dignitaries.

In answer to the objection, once plausible, always superficial, and now fast becoming obsolete, that it is absurd to place the choice of their teachers in the hands of the ignorant and unlettered, the fine observation of Milton is cited, that "many may be able to judge who

is fit to be made a minister that would not be found fit to be made ministers themselves; as it will not be denied that he may be the competent judge of a neat picture or elegant poem that cannot limn the like."

With these views, it will not excite surprise that our author takes as strong ground in respect to ordination as the most rigid Congregationalist could desire. Rejecting at once all those notions which conceive of it as some mysterious gift or prerogative—which in fact degrade it to a cabalistic process and are neither more nor less than the disguised remnants of popery, he regards it as the public and formal ratification of the act of election—the simple inauguration with appropriate ceremonies of the pastor chosen. "The essence of it," he claims, "lies not in the imposition of hands, nor in the communication of any mysterious something, but in *the solemn invocation of the Divine presence and assistance.*" This is substantially, if not precisely, the view laid down in the Cambridge Platform: "His *ordination* we account but the solemn putting a man into his place and office in the church, whereunto he had a right before by election; being like the installing of a magistrate in the commonwealth." Nor were the framers of that document by any means singular in this view. "As for ordination," says Milton, "what is it but the laying on of hands, an outward sign, a symbol of admission?" Accordingly Dr. D. agrees with the Cambridge Platform in affirming that it belongs to each church to ordain its ministers, first by the agency of the presbytery or elders of the church itself, if such it has residing with it, and next, in the absence of these, "by some of the brethren orderly chosen by the church thereunto." The abstract validity of an ordination, in the latter mode, we see not how any Congregationalist can deny. It follows by necessity from its fundamental principle. If the people may *elect* officers which is the greater and wherein the substance of the office doth consist" (says the Cambridge Platform), "they may much more, occasion and need so requiring, *impose hands in ordination*, which is less and but the accomplishment of the other."

A Congregational church, therefore, in varying from either of the modes of inauguration above specified, and extending an invitation to neighboring churches to assist in the ordination of its pastor, is to be understood as in no manner confessing that it does not possess the power to induct him into office, but only as embracing a convenient opportunity of recognizing the unity of faith and the friendly relations which subsist between them, or in other words as performing an act of ecclesiastical courtesy and fellowship. Notwithstanding the doubts which our author expresses, the practical effect of councils for ordina-

tion has been good; and after an experience of more than a century and a half, they have become too deeply rooted in the confidence and affections of the churches of New England ever to be displaced, unless such claims of jurisdiction should be set up by ecclesiastical councils as to render their discontinuance a matter of stern necessity.

For authoritative courts of review, Dr. D. finds no sanction in the New Testament. The assembly recorded in Acts xv., he thinks, is not in point because its decision emanated from inspired men. Consultative assemblies, therefore, should be admitted on the ground of expediency, not on the basis of Scripture. Councils, he argues, should not be standing bodies, the tendency of which is to prepare the way for abridging the liberties of the churches, but wholly *occasional*, and always with the distinct understanding that they are only *advisory* and *persuasive*.

The third main question at issue in regard to church polity, respects the relation which ministers sustain towards each other. Are there different grades of office among them, such as exist in monarchical governments, or are all Christ's ministers in respect to power and prerogative equal? In answer to this, Dr. Davidson, after justly remarking that office-bearers are not essential to the *being*, but to the *well-being* of a church, takes the ground that the terms elder and bishop designate one and the same office, the former being the Jewish name, which was probably transferred from the זְקֵנִים of the synagogue, and only at a later period gave way to the latter term (ἐπίσκοπος) with which the Gentile churches were previously familiar, as denoting an office in the Athenian State. In confirmation of this theory in respect to the substitution of one term for the other, he cites the fact that Peter and James who labored among the Jewish churches, invariably employ the term *elders*, not *bishops*. He denies that any traces of diocesan bishops are to be found in the N. T., and maintains that the only ordinary officers are bishops or elders and deacons. The primitive churches, he thinks, had each a plurality of ordained elders, and labors to show that such an arrangement would be useful at the present day.

From this rapid sketch, it will be seen that the results at which Dr. Davidson has arrived, are substantially identical with the Congregational system of church government. They more nearly accord, however, with that type of Congregationalism embodied in the Cambridge Platform, than with the form of church polity at present prevalent either in New England or in the mother country.

While his conclusions on some points, rather of detail than of principle, appear to us to rest on insufficient grounds, and in some in-

stances to be tinged with the influence of the strict Independency prevailing in Great Britain, we think no reader can fail to admire the spirit of candor and independent research which pervades the work.

The limited space to which notices of new works are necessarily confined in this Journal, allows us only to commend this new treatise, on what is destined to prove one of the greatest questions of our times, to the American public, with the assurance that though they may not agree with the learned and estimable author in all respects, they will find substantial results which we doubt not will be generally recognized as an addition to our literature in this particular department. G. E. D.

Northampton, Ms.

ARTICLE IX.

THE RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE OF LUTHER IN THE CLOISTER OF ERFURT.

By B. Sears, D. D., President of Newton Theol. Institution.

The origin of the Reformation, as a religious movement and as connected with the efforts of Luther, is to be traced to what he himself experienced in the convent at Erfurt. There he first made thorough trial of that outward and legal system of religion which had nearly banished the gospel of Christ from the church. There he groped his way through the mazes of papal error, and found the path that led to Christ as the simple object of his faith and love. He went through all the process of overcoming the elements of a ceremonial and of appropriating those of an evangelical religion by the force of his individual character, and by the power of the word and the Spirit of God. He found himself standing almost solitary on the ground of justification by faith alone, and private judgment in interpreting the Scriptures. From the time of his going to Wittenberg to the year 1517, he was chiefly employed in working out these two ideas, reconciling his experience with well established truths, and trying upon the minds of others, namely, of his pupils and some of the younger professors, the same experiment which he had unconsciously made upon himself. When he came to feel the full strength of his foundation, and, with the Bible and the sober use of reason as his weapons, prostrated the scholastic theology, and professor and student confessed their power,

his conscience impelled him to seize upon the first and upon every public opportunity to propagate these principles that others might share with him so unspeakable a blessing.

The study of Luther's religious experience has a two-fold interest, first, in itself as one of the most striking on record, and then as a key to the religious character of the Reformation. Until recently the subject has been wrapt in such obscurity and confusion that it has appeared more as a romance than a reality. To Karl Jürgens[1] belongs the honor of having first collected and arranged all the known facts of the case in such a way, as to furnish a pretty clear history of what was before both imperfect and chaotic. Availing ourselves for the most part, of the results of his recent investigations, we shall venture to attempt an outline of Luther's religious history from the time that he entered the monastery to that of his removal to Wittenberg, when the stupendous moral change in him had become complete.

The Bible.

We learn from Mathesius, what we might, indeed, infer from his subsequent character, that Luther was a young man of buoyant and cheerful feelings; and, at the same time, that he began every day with prayer, and went daily to church service. Furthermore, "he neglected no university exercise, put questions to his teachers, often reviewed his studies with his fellow students, and whensoever there were no appointed exercises he was in the library."

"Upon a time," continues the same writer, "when he was carefully viewing the books, one after another, to the end that he might know them that were good, he fell upon a Latin Bible, which he had never before seen in all his life. He marvelled greatly as he noted that more text, or more epistles and gospels were therein contained than were set forth and explained in the common postils and sermons preached in the churches. As he was looking over the Old Testament, he came upon the history of Samuel and of his mother Hannah. This did he quickly read through, with hearty delight and joy; and, because that this was all new to him, he began to wish from the bottom of his heart that our faithful God would one day bestow upon him such a book for his own." Luther, who often alludes to this incident, once says that it occurred "when he was a young man and a bachelor of arts." At another time he says, "when I was twenty years old, I had never seen a Bible." In another place, he intimates

[1] Luther von seiner Geburt bis zum Ablass-streite von Karl Jürgens. 3 vols. 8vo. 1846—1847.

that he saw the Bible only once while he was in the university, and that an interval of about two years intervened before he saw another copy in the cloister. "I was reading," he says, "a place in Samuel; but it was time to go to lecture. I would fain have read the whole book through, but there was not opportunity then. I asked for a Bible, however, as soon as I had entered the cloister." He became owner of a postil, which pleased him much, because it contained more of the gospels than were commonly read during the year. The study of the Scriptures, therefore, seems, in the case of Luther, to have commenced rather in the cloister than in the university.

Luther becomes Monk.

The whole course of Luther's training tended to impress upon his mind the sanctity of the monastic life. This, in his view, was the surest way of pleasing God, and of escaping the terrors of the world to come. Educated as he was to a legal view of religion, and conscious, at the same time, that he had not fulfilled the law, nothing remained to him but to continue as he was at the risk of his salvation, or to seek for a higher kind of piety, by which the law of God might be satisfied. His prevailing feeling was to continue in his former course of life; but any sudden terror would revive the alarms of his conscience, and suggest the thought of putting his anxious mind forever at rest by fleeing to a cloister as a refuge for his soul. In this way was his mind finally determined. In 1505, Alexius, a friend of Luther in the university, was assassinated. Soon after, about the first of July, as Luther was walking in a retired road, between Erfurt and Stotterheim, he was overtaken by a violent thunderstorm, and the lightning struck near his feet. He was nearly stunned, and exclaimed in his terror: "Help, beloved St. Anne, and I will straightway become a monk."[1]

Besides the above-mentioned occurrences, there was an epidemic raging in the university; many of the teachers and pupils had fled, and it was quite natural that Luther's mind should be in a very gloomy state. St. Anne was the reigning saint in Saxony at this time, having recently become an object of religious regard, to whose honor the Saxon town Annaburg was built, and who for a time was

[1] Such is the view in which the testimony of Luther, Melanchthon, Mathesius and other early witnesses is best united. The representation of less competent and later witnesses, that Alexius was killed by lightning is now abandoned by all the historians.

the successful rival even of the virgin Mary. Hence the invocation of this saint by Luther.

Referring to this event in a dedication of a work on Monastic Vows to his father, Luther says: "I did not become a monk cheerfully and willingly, much less, for the sake of obtaining a livelihood; but being miserable and encompassed with the terrors and anguish of death, I made a constrained and forced vow." He again says, "it was not done from the heart, nor willingly." These statements taken in connection with several others, where it is said that certain views of religion drove him to the monastery, make it plain that it required the force of excited fears to induce him to enter upon a life which he had always regarded as the most sacred, and as most surely leading to heaven. How much he then needed the instruction which Staupitz at a later period gave him!

Before executing his purpose, he took two weeks for reflection. It has been said that during this interval, he regretted his rash vow. No doubt he had to pass through severe mental struggles, that in his calmer moments opposite considerations would present themselves to his mind, and none with more force than that of having gone counter to the known wishes of his father, by whose toils he had been sustained at the university. In his Commentary on Genesis 49: 13, he says, "When I had made a beginning in the study of the liberal arts and in philosophy, and comprehended and learned so much therein that I was made master, I might, after the example of others, have become teacher and instructor in turn, or have set forth my studies and made greater advancement therein. But I forsook my parents and kindred, and betook myself, contrary to their will, to the cloister and drew on the cowl. For I had suffered myself to be persuaded that by entering into a religious order, and taking upon me such hard and rigorous labor, I should do God a great service." Here may properly be introduced a few other sayings of Luther, in respect to the motives which led him to take this step. In a manuscript preserved at Gotha, he is represented as saying, "I went into the cloister and forsook the world because I despaired of myself." "I made a vow for the salvation of my soul. For no other cause did I betake myself to a life in the cloister, than that I might serve God and please him forevermore." "I thought God did not concern himself about me;" he says in one of his sermons, "if I get to heaven and be happy, it will depend mostly on myself; I knew no better than to think that by my own works I must rid myself of sin and death. For this cause I became a monk; I had a most bitter experience withal." "O! thought I, if I only go into a cloister and serve God

in a cowl and with a shorn crown, he will reward me and bid me welcome."[1]

During the interval of two weeks, while he kept his design from his parents and from his fellow students, the Gotha manuscript says that he communicated it to Andrew Staffelstein, as the head of the university, and to a few pious females. Staffelstein advised him to join the Franciscan order, whose monastery had just been rebuilt in Erfurt, and went immediately with him to the cloister, lest a change should take place in Luther's mind. The teacher resorted also to flattery, no doubt with a good conscience, saying that of none of his pupils did he entertain higher hopes in respect to piety and goodness. When they were arrived at the cloister, the monks urged his connecting himself immediately with the order. Luther replied, that he must first make known his intention to his parents. But Staffelstein and the friars rejoined, that he must forsake father and mother and steal away to the cross of Christ. Whosoever putteth his hand to the plough and looketh back is not worthy of the kingdom of God. In this "monstrous unfriendliness," as Luther calls it, "savoring more of the wolf and the tyrant than of the Christian and the man," the monks were only carrying out the principle which Jerome had taught them and which was the more weighty, being sanctioned by his great name. As quoted by Luther, in his Commentary on Gen. 43: 30, the words of that ancient father run thus: "Though thy father should lie before thy door weeping and lamenting, and thy mother should show the body that bore thee and the breasts that nursed thee, see that thou trample them under foot, and go onward straightway to Christ." By such perversion of Scripture and reason did the monks deprive many a parent of the society of his children. "That," says Luther again, "is the teaching of antichrist, and you may boldly tell him, he lies. Next to obedience to himself, before all things and above all things, God requireth obedience to parents. — A son or a daughter runs away from his father, and goes into a cloister against his will. The pope with his party of Herodians approves the act, and thus compels the people to tear in pieces a command of God in order to worship God." "Hadst thou known," it is said in the above-mentioned dedicatory epistle of Luther to his father, "that I was then in thy power, wouldst thou not, from thine authority as a father, have plucked me out of my cowl? Had I known it, I would not have attempted such a thing against thy will and knowledge, though I must suffer a thousand deaths." It seems, therefore, that Luther's mind was in a conflict between a sense of duty to his parents,

[1] Comm. on John 15: 16.

and a false persuasion of duty to his own soul and to God. Even the father was somewhat puzzled by the speciousness of the monastic logic. But the son made the former consideration yield to the latter, which the father always maintained was an error. We must not be surprised that such scruples were entertained in respect to the filial obligation of one who was about twenty-two years of age; for, not to mention that by law a son did not reach the age of majority till he was twenty-five years of age, filial obedience was, as in the patriarchal age, considered as due to an indefinite period of life.

Luther, however, did not enter into the cloister of the Franciscans, but preferred that of the Augustinian Eremites. Undoubtedly his respect for Augustine, and for the literary and more elevated character of that order decided his choice. This took place about the middle of July, 1505. On the evening preceding, he invited his university friends to a social party. The hours passed away in lively conversation and song. Until near the close of that evening, according to Melanchthon, the guests had no intimation of what was to follow. When Luther announced his purpose to them, they endeavored to dissuade him from it. But it was all in vain. "To-day," said he, "you see me; after this, you will see me no more." The very same night, or early on the following morning, he presented himself to the door of the convent, according to previous arrangement, and was admitted. His scholastic, classical and law books he gave to the booksellers; his master's ring, given when he took that degree, and his secular habits he sent to his parents. The only books which he retained were the two Roman poets, Virgil and Plautus, a circumstance that throws light upon the peculiarly susceptible and almost romantic character of his mind, no less than the festive hour with which he had the resolution to close his secular career. He informed his other friends and his parents by letter of the important step he had taken. The former, lamenting that such a man should be buried alive, as it were, almost beseiged the cloister, seeking for two successive days an interview with their friend. But the cloister door was bolted against them, and Luther was not to be seen by them for a month. Luther's father, probably, did not come immediately to the cloister, as some writers have asserted, confounding this occasion with that of his ordination as priest, but replied to his son's letter in a manner which showed the highest displeasure, withholding the respectful form of address (Ihr) which from the time the degree of master of arts was conferred, he had ever given him, and employing one (du) which was ordinarily given to children and servants. To human view, the course of Luther, in leaving the university and the

study of the law, and in entering a cloister, seems a most unfortunate one. The best years of his life, one would think, were thrown away upon solemn trifles. But, if we consider that, after a public education, an introverted life often contributes most to true greatness, by holding a man long at the very fountain head of thought and reflection, as was the case with Chrysostom, Augustine and many others, and if, moreover, we consider that the false foundations of a system of error are often best understood by him who has made the most perfect trial of them, we shall conclude with Luther, "God ordered that I should become monk not without good reason, that, being taught by experience, I might take up my pen against the pope."

Luther in the Cloister.

1. The novitiate—1505. The first act was that of assuming the dress of the novitiate. The solemn ceremonies of that occasion were settled by the rules of the order. The transaction was to take place in the presence of the whole assembly. The prior proposed to the candidate the question, whether he thought his strength was sufficient to bear the burdens about to be laid upon him, at the same time reminding him of the strictness of their discipline, and the renunciation of one's own will which was required. He referred to the plain living and clothing, the nightly vigils and daily toils, the mortifications of the flesh, the reproach attached to a state of poverty and mendicancy, the languor produced by fasting, and the tedium of solitude and other similar things which awaited him. The candidate replied, that with God's assistance, he would make the attempt. The prior said, we receive you then for a year on trial, and may God who has begun a good work in you, carry it on and perfect it. The whole assembly then cried, "Amen," and struck up the sacred song, Magne pater Augustine (Great father Augustine). Meanwhile the head was shorn, the secular robes laid aside, and the spiritual robes put on. The prior intimated to the individual that with these last he was also to put on the new man. He now kneeled down before the prior, responses were sung, and the divine blessing was invoked thus: May God who has converted this young man from the world, and prepared for him a mansion in heaven, grant that his daily walk may correspond with his calling, and that he may have occasion to be thankful for this day's decision, etc. Then the procession moved on, singing responses again, till they reached the choir, where they all prostrated themselves in prayer. The candidate was next conducted to the common hall of the cloister, where he received from the prior and all

the brethren the fraternal kiss. He then bowed the knee again before the prior, who, after reminding him that he who persevereth to the end shall be saved, gave him over to the preceptor, whose duty it was to instruct him during his novitiate.

The order of Augustinian Eremites, which originated about the middle of the thirteenth century, was said to have nearly 2,000 cloisters, besides 300 nunneries and more than 30,000 monks. It was reformed and organized anew at the council of Basle, in the fifteenth century. The celebrated Proles, who was at Magdeburg when Luther was there at school, was the second vicar after the reorganization, and in 1503 Staupitz was the fourth, who in the following year, that is, the year before Luther entered the cloister at Erfurt, gave to the order a new constitution. The abler men of this order, such as Proles and Staupitz, were led, by the study of the writings of Augustine, to entertain his views of the doctrine of divine grace and of justification by faith. The Augustinian friars were generally more retiring, studious and contemplative than the ambitious, gross and bigotted Dominicans and Franciscans. Hence Luther's preference of the order.

According to the new rules laid down by Staupitz, the prior was to give to the novice a preceptor and guide, who should be learned, experienced and zealous for the interests of the order. It was the duty of this preceptor to initiate the novice into a knowledge of all the rules and regulations that had been established, to explain to him the system of worship to be observed, and the signs by which directions were silently given, to see that he was awaked by night to attend to all the vigils, that he observed at their proper times and places the prescribed bowings, genuflections and prostrations, that he did not neglect the silent prayers and private confessions, and that he made a proper use of the books, sacred utensils and garments. The novice was to converse with no one except in the presence of the preceptor or prior, never to dispute respecting the regulations, to take no notice of visitors, to drink only in a sitting posture and holding the cup with both hands, to walk with down-cast eyes, to bow low in receiving every gift, and to say, The Lord be praised in his gifts, to love poverty, avoid pleasure and subdue one's own will, to read the Scriptures diligently, and to listen to others eagerly and learn with avidity. Luther was so thoroughly drilled in all these practices, that he retained some of them, as a matter of habit, through life. "The young monks," says he, in referring to one of these practices, "were taught, when they received anything, if it were but a feather, to bow low and say, God be praised for everything he gives."

Trespasses were classified under the heads of small, great, greater, greatest. To the smaller belong the failing to go to church as soon as the sign is given, or forgetting to touch the ground instantly with the hand and to smite the breast, if in reading in the choir or in singing the least error is committed; looking about the house in time of service; making any disturbance in the dormitory or in the cell; desiring to sing or read otherwise than in the prescribed order; omitting prostration when giving thanks at the annunciation or christmas; forgetting the benediction in going out or coming in; neglecting to return books or garments to their proper places; dropping one's food, or spilling one's drink, or eating without saying grace, etc., etc. To great trespasses were reckoned contending with any one, reminding one of a former fault, breaking the prescribed silence or fasts, looking at females, or talking with them, except at the confessional or in brief replies, etc.

Luther was at once put into subjection to all these trivial and often senseless laws. The good monks seemed to delight in teaching lessons of humility. With his studies, in which he was already too much distinguished for them, they were not at all pleased. He himself says, "As I came into the cloister, they said to me, it shall be with you as it was with us, put the sack around your neck." Again he says: "In Italy there is an order of *Ignorants*, who vow sacred ignorance. All orders might lay claim to that title, for that they give heed only to the words, but not to the sense of what they read or repeat. They say, if *you* do not know the meaning of the Scriptures and the prayers, Satan does and flees. The alpha and omega of the monks is to hate knowledge and study. If a brother is given to study, they straightway surmise that he wishes to bear rule over them."

The Erfurt monks were not all of the most spiritual character. Luther says of the monks in general, that "for one fast they had three feasts. At the evening collation two cans of good beer and a little can of wine were given to each monk, besides spiced cakes and salted bread to stimulate their thirst. The poor brethren appeared like fiery angels." That Luther had in mind the monks at Erfurt is pretty evident from his saying that he had, in the papacy, never seen a proper fast; that "abstinence from meat" signified only to have the best of fish with the nicest seasoning, and good wine besides. "They taught," says he, "that we should despise riches, vineyards and fields; and yet they seek after them most of all, and eat and drink the very best. One brother in the cloister could consume five biscuits, when one was enough for me." One doctor, in the cloister, had

omitted the canonical hours for three months, so that he could not now make them all up. He therefore gave a few guldens to two brethren to help him pray, that he might get through the sooner.

Of the treatment which Luther received after entering upon his novitiate it is not easy to judge. Was it according to the spirit of the order, and consequently a mode of treatment to which all without distinction were at first subject? or was the deportment of the monks towards Luther particularly harsh and severe? Some considerations may be urged in favor of the former view. Luther himself represents it as the vice of the system. "True obedience, that alone of which they boast, the monks seek to prove by requiring unreasonable, childish and foolish things, all which were to be cheerfully submitted to." He never complains of faring worse than others; but he does complain that *no* distinctions were made according to the physical constitution and state of individuals—that "every man's shoes were made on one and the same last, and that all were governed by one inflexible rule." "Augustine, he says, "acted more wisely, teaching that all men were not to be measured by the same rule." So much, however, seems to be true in regard to the members of the cloister of Erfurt, that they looked with jealousy upon the distinguished and learned novitiate, and felt a satisfaction in seeing him performing the menial offices of door-keeper, sweep, and street-beggar in the very city where he had so many literary acquaintances to witness his humiliation.

With what patience and acquiescence he submitted to all the duties and tasks imposed upon him by his order, we learn from his own declarations. These are his words. "I was a monk without ever complaining; of that I can justly boast." "When I first became a monk, I stormed the very heavens." He speaks of having exposed himself in watchings "till he nearly perished in the cold;" of having afflicted and tortured his body, "so that he could not have endured it long;" and of having prayed, fasted, watched and inflicted bodily pains, and so seriously injured his head, "that he had not recovered, and should not so long as he lived." For the sake of the connection we will introduce here a passage that probably relates, in part at least, to a somewhat later period. "I verily kept the rules of my order with great diligence and zeal. I often fasted till I was sick and almost dead. I not only observed the rules straitly, but took upon myself special tasks, and had a peculiar way by myself. My seniors strove against this my singularity, and with good reason. I was a shameful persecutor and destroyer of my own body; for I fasted, prayed, watched, and made myself weary and languid beyond what I could endure."

Connected with such a state of mind and such religious severities, we should naturally expect to see the greatest reverence for the papal hierarchy. It cannot be surprising, therefore, that we should hear him say, "I can with truth affirm, if there was ever one who held the papal laws and the traditions of the fathers in reverence, I was such." "I had an unfeigned veneration for the pope, not seeking after livings, or places and such like, but whatsoever I did, I did with singleness of heart, with upright zeal and for the glory of God." "So great was the pope in my esteem that I accounted departing from him in the least article a sin, deserving damnation; and this ungodly opinion made me to hold Huss as an accursed heretic, so much so that I esteemed it a sin only to think of him; and, to defend the pope's authority, I would have kindled the fire to burn the heretic, and should have believed that I was thereby showing the highest obedience to God."

We have learned that Luther was driven to the cloister by a disquieted conscience, and superstitious fears and hopes. It is natural to inquire how far his conscience was quieted, his fears allayed, and his hopes realized. Let him answer for himself. "When I was a monk I was outwardly much holier than now. I kept the vow I had taken with the greatest zeal and diligence by day and by night, and yet I found no rest, for all the consolations which I drew from my own righteousness and works were ineffectual." Doubts all the while cleaved to my conscience, and I thought within myself, Who knoweth whether this is pleasing and acceptable to God, or not." "Even when I was the most devout, I went as a doubter to the altar, and as a doubter I went away again. If I had made my confession, I was still in doubt; if, upon that, I left off prayer, I was again in doubt, for we were wrapt in the conceit, that we could not pray and should not be heard, unless we were wholly pure and without sin, like the saints in heaven." It is difficult for us to conceive of the anguish which a tender and delicate conscience would feel under the doctrines which were taught in respect to confession. Who could be certain that he knew the nature and extent of all the sins he had committed? What infallible rule had he by which he could judge rightly of all the acts and circumstances connected with sin? Of his motives and intentions he might have a tolerably accurate knowledge. But how was it with acts in themselves considered, which were the main things in the ethics of the confessional? Even of those sins which were defined and measured by the rules of the order, since they related to a thousand trifling acts recurring almost every moment, few persons could retain a distinct consciousness or memory so as to be perfectly sure at each confession that nothing was omitted or forgotten. And yet one

such omission vitiated the whole confession and rendered prayer useless. This was the scorpion sting which Luther so keenly felt. He always doubted the completeness of his confession. If he prayed, it might be of no use; if he neglected prayer, his doubts were increased. "The confession was an intolerable burden laid upon the church. For there was no sorer trouble, as we all know by experience, than that every one should be compelled to make confession, or be guilty of a mortal sin. Besides, confession was beset with so many difficulties, and the conscience tormented with reckoning up such different sorts of sins, that no one could make his confession perfect enough." "If the confession was not perfect, and done with exceeding particularity, the absolution was of none effect, nor were the sins forgiven. Therewith were the people so hard pressed, that there was no one but must despair of confessing so perfectly (it was in very deed impossible), and no conscience could abide the trial, nor have confidence in the absolution."

"When I was a monk, I used ofttimes to be very contrite for my sins, and to confess them all as much as was possible, and performed the penance that was enjoined unto me as straitly and as rigorously as I could. Yet for all this, my conscience could never be tranquil and assured, but was always in doubt, and said, This or that hast thou not done rightly; thou wast not sorrowful enough for thy sins; this and that sin thou didst forget in thy confession." Though he "confessed every day, it was all in vain." "The smart and anguish of conscience," he elsewhere says, "were as great in the cowl, as they were before out of it." These declarations may easily be reconciled with others which represent him as feeling happy when he could say, "To-day I have done no wrong; I have been obedient to my prior, have fasted and prayed, and God is gracious towards me." These occasions were of rare occurrence, and were the results of that superficial feeling which the strongest and profoundest minds are liable to have in those passive moments when they surrender themselves to the influence of popular belief. But the chief current of Luther's feelings, in spite of all the violence he did to himself to prevent it, ran counter to that belief, so that in after life, when reverting to these scenes, he could speak of the predominant state of his mind as though there had been no other. The effect of such a view of religion as he then entertained, and of such an experience as he had of a daily deviation from its precepts, is truthfully described in the following words, undoubtedly the utterance of his own heart. "He who thinketh that a Christian ought to be without any fault, and yet seeth many faults in himself, must needs be consumed at length with melancholy and despair."

Not only did Luther suffer from the unexpected discovery of the real sinfulness of his heart, but he was scarcely less tormented with imaginary sins and false scruples of conscience. "The devil," says he, "seizes upon some trifling sin, and by that casts into the shade all the good works which thou hast thy life long done, so that thou dost see nothing but this one sin." "I speak from experience; I know his wiles and subtilties, how of one little mote he maketh many great beams, that is to say, of that which is the least sin, or no sin at all, he maketh a very hell, so that the wide world is too strait for one."

The fiery imagination of Luther, which solitude served but to kindle into an intenser flame, the strength and depth of his religious passions which found no such vent as they needed, and the bewildered state of his mind in respect to the elementary principles of Christianity, all conspired to give him an air of peculiarity which the monks could not comprehend. Too much of original character lay concealed beneath that demure yet singular deportment to be controlled even by the iron forms which the order laid upon all alike. Luther's mind had an individuality which separated him from the mass and heightened his solitude. In the mental processes through which he passed, he was alone and without sympathy. He was driven, at last, almost to phrenzy. Often was his bodily frame overpowered by the intensity of his excited feelings, and there was no skilful physician of the soul at hand to prescribe for his case. Speaking on this point, he observes, "In my huge temptations which consumed my body so that I well nigh lost my breath, and hardly knew whether I had still any brain left or not, there was no one to comfort me." If he opened his heart to any one, the only reply he received was, "I know nothing about such temptations," and he was left to the gloomy conclusion, that he "was to be alone in this disconsolate state." But as the melancholy mood here described only commenced during his novitiate and extended through the second year of his life in the cloister, we must break off the narration for the present, and direct our attention to his other employments during the first year.

"When I was received into the cloister," he said once to his friends, according to the Gotha manuscript, "I called for a Bible, and the brethren gave me one. It was bound in red morocco. I made myself so familiar with it that I knew on what page and in what place every passage stood. Had I kept it, I should have been an excellent textual theologian. No other study than that of the Holy Scriptures pleased me. I read therein zealously, and imprinted them on my memory. Many a time a single pregnant passage would abide the whole day long in my mind. On significant words of the

prophets, which even now I remember well, I cogitated again and again, although I could not apprehend the meaning thereof; as, for example, we read in Ezekiel, I desire not the death of the sinner." Again, he says, "Not till after I had made myself acquainted with the Bible, did I study the (scholastic) writers." By "the writers," he must mean the scholastic theologians. For he himself says, in a preface to Bugenhagen's edition of Athanasius, that he "read the colloquy between Athanasius and Arius with great interest, in the first year of his monastic life, at Erfurt." No doubt he also read the legends of the saints, the Lives of the Fathers (a favorite book with him), and other works of a similar tendency. The new rules of the order prescribed, however, the diligent study of the Scriptures, and the probationary year appears to have been designated for biblical study. But we must guard against being misled by the fact that there was such a rule, and by the name that was given to the study. Neither the sentiments nor the practice of the Erfurt monks coincided with the rule. Though they could not refuse to give a Bible to the novice who requested it, they discouraged the study of it. Besides, Luther's time was so much occupied with other useless and menial services that his progress in the study of the Scriptures must have been much impeded. He was, furthermore, destitute of suitable helps for studying them critically. He did not see the Bible in the original, nor had he then any knowledge of the Greek or Hebrew. He had only the Latin Vulgate, with a most miserable commentary, called the *Glossa Ordinaria*, or Common Gloss. And, what is more than all, he brought to the study of the Bible a mind overborne with monastic and papal prejudices. The method of what was called biblical studies, as then pursued in the monasteries and universities, was entirely different from that to which we, in the present age, are accustomed. The Bible was not studied as a whole, nor any of the sacred writers in a connected manner so as to learn the scope and general design of the book. Of course, the author was not made his own interpreter, nor were any sound rules of interpretation observed. A text was, in the first place, taken out of its connection, and interpreted metaphysically, as if it were a scholastic maxim, and forced at once into an unnatural connection with dialectics, or used as a secondary and subsidiary support of a doctrine which rested mainly on a metaphysical basis. In the next place, the literal sense was deserted at pleasure, and an allegorical one introduced to suit the object of the interpreter. The absurd conceits of Origen, Jerome and other early fathers of the church were handed down by tradition, and the study of such traditionary interpretation, collected in compends, was called

biblical study. The false interpretations to be found in the papal bulls and decretals, and in the approved works of the scholastic writers, would furnish a large chapter in the book of human follies. Luther was not only under these influences but yielded to them. In a letter to Spalatin, June 29, 1518, he says, "I myself followed the doctrines and rules of the scholastic theology, and according to them did I desire to handle the Scriptures." In his commentary on Genesis ix. he says, "I have often told you of what sort theology was when I first began the study thereof. The letter, said they, killeth. For this cause I was especially opposed to Lyra more than to all other teachers, because he cleaved so diligently to the text and abode by it. But now, for this selfsame reason, I prefer him before all other interpreters of Scripture." Again, he says, "When I was young, I loved allegories to such a degree, that I thought everything must be turned into allegories. To this Origen and Jerome gave occasion, whom I esteemed as being the greatest theologians." Well, indeed, might he afterwards say, "I did not learn all my theology at once." The beginning with him was feeble, and, the sincerity of his heart excepted, was of a very unpromising character.

Taking the Vow.—Second year in the Cloister, 1506.

Such was Luther's year of probation, a year in which he experienced some gratification in the study, however defective, of the Scriptures which he loved; but, on the other hand, was disappointed in respect to what was of the highest concern to him, namely, obtaining peace within himself. If it excite our wonder that he did not, at this time, while it was in his power, and before taking the irrevocable vow, determine to abandon the monastic life, and return to the university or seek some other occupation, there are other considerations which may remove our surprise. Luther's mind was of too determined a character to be turned from its course by any slight considerations. He had been trained in the school of adversity, and could courageously bear the privations and sufferings attendant on his present mode of life. The subject of religion interested him more than all others, and to this he could give his undivided attention here more easily than elsewhere. Here, too, he found a few friends, such as Usingen, his former teacher, Lange whom he assisted in study, and the excellent Susse, who is said to have been his room-mate. If his mind had as yet found no rest, possibly a longer trial, after actually taking the vow, might prove more effectual. Certainly a return to the world would imply a want of firmness, and would, besides, promise

no better results. Even if there had been no disgrace attached to leaving the cloister at the close of the novitiate, this would probably have made no difference with Luther, who seems to have made up his mind from the beginning. Speaking of the unsuccessful attempt of the friends who endeavored to keep him from entering the monastery, he says, "Thus did I abide by my purpose, thinking never again to come out of the cloister."

The rules of the order prescribed that the prior should, at the close of the year of probation, examine the novice as to his being worthy of admission. If the result was favorable, the bell was to be rung and the monks to assemble, and the prior to take his place before the steps at the altar and to address the kneeling novice in the following words: You have become acquainted with the severe life of our order, and must now decide whether you will return to the world or be consecrated to the order. If the answer was in favor of the latter, the individual was directed to put off the garb of the novice and the part of the service beginning with the words, "Our help is in the name of the Lord," was repeated, whereupon the prior laid the monk's apparel upon him, and then the ceremonies were very similar to those of entering the novitiate, described above. The vow was taken, in connection with the imposition of the hands of the prior, in these words, as reported by Cochlaeus: "I, brother Martin, make profession, and promise obedience to Almighty God, to Mary always a virgin, and to thee, my brother, the prior of this cloister in the name and in the stead of the general prior of the order of the Eremites of St. Augustine, the bishop and of his regular successors, to live in poverty and chastity, according to the rule of the said St. Augustine, until death." Then a burning taper was put into his hand, prayer was offered for him by the prior, and the brethren sung the hymn, *Veni Sancte Spiritus*, "Come Holy Spirit," after which the new brother was conducted by them to the choir of the church and received of them the paternal kiss.

The most extravagant ideas were entertained of the effect of such a formal consecration to a monastic life. As baptism was supposed to take away all sin, so this monastic baptism, as the initiation was called, was said to be equally efficacious and to have even a greater sanctity. Hence Luther was congratulated on the present occasion as being, by his own act, freed from sin and introduced into a state of primeval innocence. With this he felt flattered and pleased for the moment, but upon experiencing its utter futility, he came at length to regard it as "a pill of infernal poison, sugared over on the outside." In his Brief Reply to George, Duke of Saxony, he said: "That the

monks likened their monastic life to Christian baptism, they cannot deny; for so they have taught and practised through and through in all the world. When I made my profession, I was congratulated by the prior, the convent and the confessor that I was now innocent as a child, which had just come forth pure from its baptism. And verily I could heartily rejoice over such a glorious deed,—that I was such an excellent man, who could, by his own works, without the blood of Christ, make himself so good and holy, and that too so easily and so quickly. But though I could hear with pleasure such sweet praise and shining words concerning my own doings, and let myself pass for a wonder-worker, who could, in such a wanton manner, make himself holy and devour both death and the devil, yet would it fail when it came to the trial. For when only a small temptation of death or of sin came upon me, I fell away, and found no succour either in baptism or in the monastic state. Then was I the most miserable man on earth; day and night there was nothing but lamentation and despair, from which no one could deliver me. So I was bathed and baptized in my monasticism, and verily had the sweating sickness."

Luther was three years in the cloister at Erfurt. Of his employments and of his state of mind during the first year, or the year of his novitiate, we have already had an account. During the second year, with which we are now concerned, he was devoted to the study of the scholastic theology and to his preparation for the priesthood. His religious feelings continued of the same character substantially as in the first year, except that his anxieties and his sorrows increased. It was not till in the third year, the year of his priesthood, that new views on the subject of works and of justification shed light upon his mind and joy upon his path, and not till after that change did he take up the study of the early Christian fathers. Here then we have the means of deciding, in most cases, to which of these three periods his numerous allusions to his monastic life in Erfurt refer. If, in any passage, there be a reference to the duties of the priestly office, saying mass for example, or to the study of Augustine and other church fathers, or to more cheerful and confiding feelings in respect to God, as a loving father rather than as a stern revenger, and to Christ, as a compassionate Saviour rather than as a dreaded judge, we may safely apply the passage to the last year of Luther's residence in Erfurt. If a state of bodily and mental suffering be referred to alone, it is doubtful whether Luther had the first or second year in mind. But if harsh treatment or the regular study of the Scriptures be mentioned in the same connection, the first year is thereby indicated; whereas

if occupation with the scholastic theologians and with works which treat of the duties of the priesthood be alluded to, the second year only can be meant.

Of the personal appearance of Luther about the time of this second year, probably near its close, this being the time of his most intense mental anguish, we have a representation in a portrait taken in 1572, preserved in a church at Weimar, when the artist had the means of ascertaining how Luther appeared at the time referred to. This is furthermore supported by a letter of Luther's, in which he describes his features as they then were. The youthful flush had disappeared from his countenance. His black, piercing and fiery eye was now sunken. His small and plump face had become thin and spare. With all his sadness and dejection, there was a solemn earnestness in his mien, and his look bespoke a mind in conflict and yet determined.

It was, no doubt, either during the latter part of the preceding year, or near the beginning of this, that Staupitz, general vicar or provincial of the order in Germany, on one of his visitations to examine into the state of the several cloisters under his care, first had his attention attracted to Luther. By the rules of the order drawn up by himself, it was made his duty, as general vicar, to visit the convents for the purpose of seeing that a paternal discipline was maintained, and particularly to inquire in respect to the care taken of the sick, the instruction given to novices, and the observance of the fasts, and other prescribed duties. Staupitz was a model which all provincials might well imitate. He made it his concern to promote the study of the Bible, though his efforts were not always seconded by others, and to seek out and encourage young men of talent and of elevated religious character, and to inspire them, as far as possible, with a sincere love of God and of man. Such a person as Luther, learned, able, ardent, perplexed, abused, and sinking both in health and in spirits, could not escape his notice. His singular attachment to the Bible was no less gratifying than it was surprising to Staupitz. "The monks," says Luther, "did not study the Scriptures, save here and there one, who like myself took special delight therein. Often did I read them in the cloister to the great astonishment of Doctor Staupitz." Here commenced the most important acquaintance which Luther ever formed. Staupitz, at once, after knowing the character of the young monk, directed the prior to have more regard to his standing and previous habits, to release him from those humiliating and onerous tasks which had been imposed upon him. He, at the same time, encouraged Luther to prosecute the study of the Scriptures with

unabated zeal, till he should be able to turn readily to any passage that should be named. Luther now, for the first time, found a spiritual guide who was, in every essential respect, qualified to treat such critical cases as his,—one who, in his comprehensive view, recognized as well the laws of the physical and the mental constitution as the fundamental principles of the gospel. A varied order of living, and new trains of thought, originating in suggestions in regard to the true nature of Christianity, which were then as strange as those which were once made to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus, were the beginnings of a healthful process, which ultimately wrought a complete religious revolution in Luther's mind and laid in his personal experience the foundation for the Reformation. In a letter to Staupitz in 1523, he says, "I ought not to be unmindful or forgetful of you, through whom the light of the gospel first began to shine out of darkness into our hearts."

John von Staupitz was descended from an ancient noble family of Meissen or Misnia in the kingdom of Saxony. In order to gratify his love of study and pious meditation, he became an Augustinian monk, and in various universities went through an extended course of scholastic philosophy and theology. In 1497, he was made master of arts, lector or public reader of his order, and connected himself with the university of Tübingen, in the south of Germany. He rose rapidly to distinction; for in the following year he was appointed prior of the convent of Tübingen; in the next, he took the degree of biblical bachelor, or the first degree in theology, that of sententiary, or the second degree, and in 1500, that of doctor of divinity. Early disgusted with the dry and unprofitable speculations of the scholastic theologians, he turned his attention to what are called the mystical theologians, or the spiritual and experimental Christians of that age. Bernard and Gerson were his favorite authors, men in whom a spirit not unlike that of the pious Thomas à Kempis prevailed. The influence of some of the professors at Tübingen, especially of Sommerhard, united to that of the writers above named, led him to appreciate the Bible more highly than any other book, and to look to that as his only safe guide in religion and the only sure foundation of Christian theology. "It is needful for us," says Staupitz, "to study the Holy Scriptures with the greatest diligence, and with all humility, and earnestly to pray that we fail not of the truth of the gospel." He regarded that principle of love which the Holy Spirit originates in us, and which produces a union with Christ by faith, as constituting the essence of religion. This is not produced by any good works of ours, but is itself the producer of all good works. Our piety, therefore, does not depend on the per-

formance of rites and ceremonies prescribed by the church, nor can it be estimated by such a standard; but it depends on the state of the heart and on the exercise of the spiritual affections. Our union with the church is not the cause of our union with Christ, but *vice versa*. "First, God gives to all the faithful one heart and one soul in him, and on this wise unites them together, and of this comes the unity of the church."

These are some of the characteristic features of the piety and faith of Staupitz; and in them we cannot fail to recognize the undeveloped germs of salvation by grace and justification by faith in Christ, as afterwards maintained by his greater disciple. Such a spirit was the very opposite of that which animated Tetzel in the sale of indulgences.

When, in 1502, the Elector Frederic of Saxony founded the university of Wittenberg, he employed Staupitz first as a counsellor and negotiator, and then as a dean or superintendent of the theological faculty. In the next year, the Chapter of the Order chose him general vicar; and it was in this capacity that he was brought into connection with Luther. His influence upon the cloisters under his charge was of the happiest kind; and his efforts to promote biblical studies, and to revive the spirituality of his brethren, no doubt prepared, in part, the way for multitudes of them to embrace the doctrines of Luther. The testimony of the latter to his worth, may properly have place here. "He was an estimable man, not only worthy to be listened to with reverence, as a scholar, in seats of learning and in the church; but also at the court of princes, and in the society of the great, he was held in much estimation for his knowledge of the world."

From the nature of the case, we could not suppose that the first interview of Staupitz with Luther could produce any great and sudden change in the latter. At that time, they were attached to opposite systems of theology, the mystic and the scholastic; and Luther's views were so interwoven with his entire character and previous training, that they could not be surrendered without many an inward struggle. Now we are expressly informed by Melanchthon that Luther's mind did not find relief till after he commenced the study of the Christian Fathers; and we learn elsewhere that this did not take place till the third year of his residence in the cloister of Erfurt. Consequently, there was an interval of nearly a year at least, and, according to the common view, namely, that Staupitz saw Luther during his novitiate, an interval of nearly two years between their first acquaintance and the conversion of Luther to the evangelical faith. From all the circumstances of the case, we are not allowed to suppose that Staupitz, at the first interview, did more than to gain some general infor-

mation in respect to Luther's character and condition, and to make a few suggestions and leave them to their effect. But though the general vicar was well grounded in the truth, and the young monk almost equally fortified in error, there was one point of strong sympathy between them, and that was, the love of the Bible. But at this time, the Bible was to Luther a very dark book. It came to him, in his spiritual ignorance, almost buried under the rubbish of the papal glosses. The gospel itself was turned into law; Christ was but a second Moses, a stern legislator and judge, from whom the oppressed sinner fled in terror, because he had not a sufficient righteousness of his own, and knew nothing of the justifying righteousness of Christ. Such was the state in which Staupitz found Luther. Instead of proceeding from a consciousness of the necessity of redemption and gratuitous justification to the ascertainment of its reality and availableness, the benighted though learned young monk went back, in a contrary direction, to speculate upon the origin and nature of evil and upon the mysteries of Providence, over which lay a pall of still denser darkness. Thus he was sometimes subject to the keenest despair, and sometimes to the most distressing thoughts. "Why," said Staupitz to him, "do you vex yourself with these speculations and high thoughts? Look to the wounds of Christ and to the blood which he shed for you. From these will the counsels of God shine forth." That is, in the cross of Christ is the best solution of the mysteries of Providence. This undoubtedly took place at the first confession which Luther made to Staupitz as the general vicar. The scene, according to Luther, was equally surprising to both parties. Such a confession, going so deeply into the nature of sin as consisting not so much in single acts, as in a moral state, a confession of the doubts and daring speculations of a great mind abused in its religious training, and consequently in a perfectly chaotic state, Staupitz had never before heard. Luther knew no better what to make of the unexpected and strange directions given him by Staupitz. No name was more terrific to him than that of Christ, an avenger and a judge, to whom he did not dare to approach without first preparing the way by engaging in his behalf the more tender sympathies of the virgin mother to soften the severities of her Divine Son. In a sermon of his first published in 1847, Luther says, "Under the papacy I fled from Christ, and trembled at his name; * * * for I looked upon him as a judge only; and in this grievously erred. St. Bernard, otherwise a godly man, said: 'Behold, in all the gospel, how sharply Christ often rebuketh, upbraideth, and condemneth the Pharisees, and flieth at them, while the virgin Mary is ever gentle and kind, and never spoke or uttered one hard word.' From hence arose the opinion that

Christ reproacheth and rebuketh, while Mary is all sweetness and love." The first confession only created mutual surprise, and Luther was still left in his sadness. This we learn from an occurrence that seems to have taken place soon after. At table, Staupitz seeing Luther still down-cast and clouded with gloom, said to him, "Why are you in such heaviness, brother Martin?" "Alas!" replied Luther, "what then am I to do?" Staupitz rejoined, "I have never had knowledge nor experience of such temptations; but so far as I can perceive, they are more needful for you than your food and drink. You know not how salutary and necessary they are for you. God bringeth them not upon you without a purpose. Without them, nothing good would come of you. You will yet see that God hath great things to accomplish through you." Numerous passages in Luther's later writings were evidently suggested by his own experience as here described. One will here suffice as a specimen. "When the heart of man is in great anguish, either the Spirit of God must needs give him gracious assurance, or there must be a godly friend to comfort him and take from him his doubts by the word of God." But as we afterwards find Luther in his former state of mind, and devoting himself with more zeal than ever to the study of the scholastic writers, we must conclude that no great and permanent change was effected in his religious views during Staupitz's first visit.

He studies the Scholastic Theology.

The effect of Staupitz's influence was delayed by the fact that, according to the usages of the Order, which he could not think of setting aside, the monk who had finished his biblical studies, as they were improperly called, was to direct his chief attention next to the scholastic theology. Staupitz was not the man for energetic or violent reform; and Usingen, whose influence in the Erfurt convent was now great, and who was probably Luther's preceptor at this time, was a zealous scholastic. Luther himself says, "When I had taken the vow, they took the Bible from me again and gave me the sophistical books. But as often as I could, I would hide myself in the library, and give my mind to the Bible."

Luther, who never shrank from a book because it was hard or disagreeable, but, on the contrary, with a consciousness of his power, took pleasure in its full exercise, now studied with iron diligence the sentences of the fathers, as collected into digests by the schoolmen. Biel and D'Ailly, he is said to have learned by heart. With the writings of Occam, Aquinas, and Scotus, he made himself very familiar.

Here we find Luther in a new conflict—his own inclination and re-

ligious wants, together with the influence of Staupitz, leading him to the Bible; the influence of the convent and his occupation with the scholastic writers, on the other hand, strengthening the false impressions under which he had grown up. Both these contending elements were exerting their whole power upon Luther, and he was to be prepared for his great work by a complete knowledge of each.

Preparation for the Priesthood.

This also constituted a part of Luther's occupation during his second year in the monastery. Biel, the last of the scholastics, his favorite author, was the writer most studied on this subject. In what follows, it will be made to appear that such employment, no less than the study of the scholastic writers in general, was adapted to carry him further and further from the Bible and the spiritualism of Staupitz and to involve him more deeply than ever in the labyrinth of papal error. We find here a striking analogy to the mazes of error through which the great Augustine passed, when half in despair, and half in docile submission, he was conducted step by step through the hollow and deceitful system of the Manicheans. The church service with which the priest was concerned, was a complicated system of symbolical acts, at the same time exercising the ingenuity, and furnishing ample materials for exciting the imagination of the students. The central point in the system was the service of mass. To this the passages of Scripture selected, their arrangement, the prayers and the hymns all referred. The antiphonies and the priestly ornaments both relate to the sacrificial offering in the mass. The rites themselves were sacred mysteries, and the officiating priest a sacred person. Luther never lost the impression which these imposing and solemn, though false forms of worship made upon him. Christ was considered as daily repeating the offering up of himself. "What an impressive moment," says a recent biographer of Luther, "when the priest finally kneeled down, the mass-bell was rung, the whole congregation fell prostrate, and the consecrated bread was changed into the body of Christ and then raised on high as the host!" What an ample field is here opened for the imagination, fired by religious superstition, to range in! "The priest," says Luther, "on account of his saying mass, is elevated above the Virgin Mary, and the angels, who cannot do so."

Biel had written an extended work on the mass-service, which was adopted as a text-book in the monasteries. He there teaches, that men must repair to the saints, through whose intercessions we are to

be saved; that the Father has given over one half of his kingdom to the Virgin, the queen of heaven; that of the two attributes of justice and mercy he has surrendered the latter to her, while he retains the former. The priest is intercessor between God and man. He offers the sacrifice of Christ in the supper, and can extend its efficacy to others. This neither the Virgin Mary nor the angels can do.

In another part of the work, Biel has several nice disquisitions on such questions as, whether the bread must always be made of wheat; how much ought to be consecrated at a time; what would be the effect of a grammatical blunder on the part of the priest in repeating the words. Thus Luther was trained by daily study to a system of practical religion which subsequently, when he was more enlightened, became abhorrent to all the feelings of his heart. "Let any one," he says, "read Biel on the Canonical Constitutions in respect to the mass, which is nevertheless the best book of the Papists on that matter, and see what execrable things are therein contained. That was once my book." Again; "Gabriel Biel wrote a book on the Canonical Constitutions which was looked upon as the best in these times; . . . when I read it my heart did bleed," that is, was in anguish from the scruples which it caused in respect to the duties of the priesthood. The rules laid down were carried into an astonishing minuteness of detail, and the least deviation from them was represented as highly sinful. Luther was so conscious of his sinfulness that he often dispaired of ever being able to officiate worthily as a priest. We, in this age, cannot appreciate his feelings in this respect unless we place ourselves in imagination precisely in his circumstances and learn with him to feel a creeping horror at the ghostly superstitions of the times. His own language will best transport us to the gloomy cell and its spiritual terrors, and to the chapel with its over-aweing mysteries. "Those priests," he remarks, "who were right earnest in religion, were so terrified in pronouncing the words of Christ, delivered at the institution of the supper, that they trembled and quaked when they came to the clause, "This is my body;" for they were to repeat every word without the least error. He who stammered, or omitted a word, was guilty of a great sin. He was, moreover, to pronounce the words without any wandering thoughts." Again, he says, "It was declared a mortal sin to leave out the word *enim* (for), or *aeterni* (eternal). . . If one had forgotten whether he had pronounced a certain word or not, he could not make the matter sure by repetition. . . Here was distress and anguish. . . . How sorely were we vexed with the mass, especially with the signs of the cross!" About fifty of these and some hundreds of other prescribed motions of the body

were to be punctiliously observed in the mass service. Special rules were given as to what was to be done if a little of the wine were spilled. Nothing can give us a better impression of the awe which the idea of Christ's real presence inspired than an incident which occurred but four years before Luther's death. In the year 1542, during the celebration of the Eucharist, some drops of the wine were accidentally spilled. Luther, Bugenhagen and the officiating minister sprang instantly and licked it up with their tongues! If such were the feelings with which the reformer noticed any little irregularity in this service in his old age, what must they have been when he was timidly preparing himself to become a Catholic priest?

In the mass itself, everything is Jewish and legal. Christ's original sacrifice is regarded as atoning only for original sin; all other sins were to be atoned for in the mass. Through the intercession of the saints, the sacrament effects an ablution from all actual sin, a defence against all dangers, against all the evils incident to the body or the mind, against the assaults of Satan, and a remission of the sins of the dead as well as of the living. How strangely is Christ here thrown into the back ground, and saints and priests raised to an impious eminence! How is the cross of Christ obscured, and an empty rite, a human invention covered with the halo of a divine glory!

Consecration as Priest in 1507.

The day appointed for his ordination as priest, the 2d of May 1507, at length arrived. Such a day was of too solemn interest, as it was observed at that time, to be allowed to pass without the presence of Luther's father, who had continued during nearly the whole period of two years to be alienated from the son in consequence of his entering the monastery. It is a mistake committed by several biographers of Luther, to represent the reconciliation, and even the visit of John Luther at the convent, as having taken place in 1505, a short time after Luther entered his novitiate. Martin was his father's favorite son. He had been sent to the university, and supported there by the father's hard earnings, in order that he might become a learned jurist and rise to distinction. His brilliant career as a student, and then as a teacher, and his entrance, under favorable circumstances, upon the study of the law, served only to give poignancy to a father's grief, when he saw that all his high hopes were to be disappointed. He was so chagrined that he refused to see his son. On the death of two other sons, who were carried off by the plague, and on the intelligence that Martin had also died of the same, his heart began to relent.

His friends took that opportunity to reason with him, and to convince him that he ought to be willing to make an offering to the Lord of whatever was dearest to him, even though it were his favorite child. To this reasoning he never assented, entertaining, as he always did, unfavorable views of monastic life; but he became so far reconciled as to accept the invitation to be present at the ordination. He came in the pomp required by the occasion, mounted on horseback with attendants, amounting to twenty in all, and honored his son with a present of twenty guldens. It was "with a sad, reluctant will," as Luther says, that his father finally consented to his permanent connection with a religious order. "Well, be it so," was his language, "God grant that it may turn out for good." When they were all seated at table, at the time of the ordination, Luther, trusting to the favorable impressions produced by the occasion, and to the influence of the company around him, ventured to touch upon the delicate subject with his father, in the following language: "Dear father, what was the reason of thy objecting to my desire to become a monk? Why wast thou then so displeased? and perhaps not reconciled yet? It is such a peaceful and godly life to live." He went on to recount the alarming events which he construed as indications of the divine will, and was warmly supported in all he said by the monks at his side. The plain-spoken, and honest miner, notwithstanding the place and the occasion, boldly and tersely replied, "Didst thou never hear that a son must be obedient to his parents? And you learned men, did you never read in the Scriptures, Thou shalt honor thy father and thy mother? . . . God grant that those signs may not prove to be lying wonders of Satan." "Never," said Luther afterwards, "did words sink deeper into a man's heart than did these of my father into mine."

The sentiments of the age, in respect to the ordination of a priest, must be kept in view, if we would understand Luther's history at this period. He himself informs us that "a consecrated priest was as much above an ordinary Christian as the morning star was above a smoking taper." "It was a glorious thing to be a new priest, and to hold the first mass. Blessed the mother who had borne a priest. Father and mother and friends were filled with joy." "The first mass was thought much of, and brought many, for the gifts and offerings came like drops of rain. The canonical hours were then observed with torch-lights. The young priest danced with his mother, if she was still living, and the bye-standers, who looked on wept for joy. If she was dead, he delivered her from purgatory."

We learn from Luther, that the bishop at his ordination gave him

the cup, and said to him, "Receive power to offer sacrifice for the living and the dead," and Luther adds, "it is a wonder that the ground did not open and swallow us both up." The words which Luther was then to employ in the mass service, which immediately followed, were, "Accept, holy Father, this unblemished sacrifice, which I, thine unworthy servant, offer to thee, the true and living God, for my innumerable sins, offences and omissions, and for all who are here present, and for all believers living, and also for the dead, that it may be for our salvation." Luther was filled with trepidation and fear, and faltered in the service, and would have left the altar, which would have occasioned his excommunication, if his preceptor, who was standing by, had not stopped him. It was the idea of "standing before God without a mediator," as he had been taught to interpret the act, and other superstitious fears with which Biel's book had filled his head,—it was this that made him pause in terror when he came to the words, "the sacrifice which I offer thee." "From that time forth," says Luther, "I read mass with great fear." Still he became a very zealous and fanatical priest, as the following passages from his writings clearly show. We now find him going from village to village "begging cheese" and "saying mass" for the peasants, and sometimes "with difficulty refraining from laughter" at the blunders of the awkward country organists, who, as he says, would introduce the wrong piece in the midst of the service. How false the principles were upon which he then acted he himself afterwards strongly testifies, "I was an unblushing Pharisee. When I had read mass and said my prayers I put my trust and rested therein, I did not behold the sinner that lay hidden under that cloak, in my not trusting in the righteousness of God but in my own, in not giving God thanks for the sacrament, but in thinking he must be thankful and well pleased that I offered up his Son to him, that is, reproached and blasphemed him. When we were about to hold mass, we were wont to say, "Now I will go and be god-father to the Virgin." Did we not know that the worst of abuses can be practised without remorse, when false principles in religion are adopted, we could scarcely believe that such representations as the following could be made in sober earnest by Luther. "Some had mass in order to become rich, and to be prosperous in their worldly business. Some, because they thought if they heard mass in the morning, then would they be secure through all the day against every suffering and peril. Some, by reason of sickness, and some for yet more foolish and sinful causes; and they could find abject priests, who, for money, would let them have their way. Furthermore, they have put a difference in the

mass, making one better for this, another better for that occasion, by inventing the seven gulden mass. The mass of the holy cross has a different virtue from the mass of the virgin. And everybody keeps still and lets the people go on, on account of the accursed gain, flowing abundantly through the mass which has so many names and virtues." "Here, you yourselves know, my dear sirs," says Luther to his opponents in 1520, "what a disgraceful traffic and marketing you have made with your sacrament. This has been the regular and every-day business of you all, buying and selling throughout all the world so many thousands of masses for money, some for a groschen (three cents), some for eight pffennigs (two cents), and some for six. There is no excusing nor denying it." "I also, when I was a monk, was wont daily to confess, to fast, to read, to pray, and to offer sacrifice, to the end that, from the vigils, mass and other works, I could impart and sell something (merit) to the laity. The monks bartered their merits away for corn and wine, as well as for money, and gave formal receipts, as is shown by many copies still extant, which ran thus: 'In consideration of one bushel of wheat, we by this writing and contract make over to you the benefit of our fastings, watchings, mortifications, mass-services and such like.' I, an arrant papist, and much fiercer mass-monger than all the rest, could not distinguish between the mass and the sacrament any more than the common people. To me the mass and the sacrament upon the altar were one and the same thing, as they were to all of us at that time. . . . I have lain sick in the infirmary, and viewed Christ in no other light than that of a severe judge, whom I must appease with my monastic works. . . . Therefore, my way and custom was, when I had finished my prayers or mass, always to conclude with such words as these: 'My dear Jesus, I come to thee and entreat thee to be pleased with whatsoever I do and suffer in my order, and to accept it as a composition for my sins? Twenty years ago, if any one desired mass, he should have come and purchased it of me, I cleaved to it with all my heart and worshipped it. . . . I held mass every day and knew not but that I was going straight to heaven. . . . I chose for myself twenty-one saints, read mass every day, calling on three of them each day, so as to complete the circuit every week. Especially did I invoke the holy virgin, as her womanly heart was more easily touched, that she might appease her son." Again he says, "I thought that by invoking three saints daily and by letting my body waste away with fastings and watchings, I should satisfy the law, and shield my conscience against the goad of the driver. But it all availed me nothing. The further I went on in this way, the more

was I terrified, so that I should have given over in despair, had not Christ graciously regarded me, and enlightened me with the light of his gospel."

Need we any further proof that a long period intervened between his first conversations with Staupitz and the time that the true light of the gospel broke in upon his soul? Here he represents himself as in the grossest darkness and in the most wretched condition, long after he had entered upon the duties of the priesthood; and yet he was not ordained till May 2, 1507. So much is certain; Staupitz was only occasionally at Erfurt, probably not more than twice or three times during Luther's residence in the cloister there. His first visit brought him in contact with Luther, but had not the effect to extricate the latter from the scholastic errors in which he was completely entangled. It was at a later period, and probably after the second visit of Staupitz at Erfurt, that Luther wrote to him frequently on the subject of his wretchedness. "When I was a monk," said Luther once to his friends, "I wrote ofttimes to Dr. Staupitz; and once I wrote to him, exclaiming, 'Oh, my sins, my sins!' Then Staupitz gave me this reply: "You would be without sin, and yet you have no proper sins. Christ forgives very sins, such as parricide, blasphemy, contempt of God, adultery, and such like. These are sins indeed. You must have a register, in which stand veritable sins, if Christ is to help you." This paradoxical language is explained in a letter of Luther to Spalatin, written in 1544. "Staupitz once comforted me in my sorrow, on this wise. You would be a painted sinner and have a painted Christ as a Saviour. You must make up your mind that Christ is a very Saviour, and you a very sinner." The importance of these words to Luther, and their influence upon the character of Luther's subsequent religious views, as seen in all his writings, it will not be easy for the casual reader to apprehend. Luther was in serious error, and had great and incessant anguish on two points. He looked upon unintentional negligence or forgetfulness of the arbitrary rules of his Order, which were as countless as they were foolish, as being the heinous sin against God; and then he supposed great sinfulness was a bar to forgiveness. On the former point, Staupitz used a little raillery; and on the latter, he furnished Luther the cardinal doctrine of the Reformation, that forgiveness did not depend at all upon the number or magnitude of one's sins, but simply and solely on penitence for them. This is what Luther means, where, hundreds of times in his sermons and other writings, he says that the papists did not preach the gospel, which is the forgiveness of sins; but the law, which is only the knowledge of sin, without a Saviour. We might fill the remainder of this

article with passages from his works, which do nothing but re-echo the sentiment which he learned first from the lips of his spiritual counsellor, and then by an uncommonly deep and protracted experience. We must, therefore, not fail to notice, that in these very suggestions of Staupitz lie the true seeds of the Reformation. In proof of the above assertion, we will adduce but one passage. We will take it from the same letter to Spalatin just mentioned. "You have thus far been but a slender sinner; you reproach yourself with very trifling sins. Come and join yourself to us, real, great, and daring sinners, that you may not make Christ of no account to us, who is a deliverer not from pretended and trifling sins, but from true, great, nay the greatest of sins. Let me put you in mind of my own case, when I was tempted and tried like as you now are, albeit I am now strong in Christ. Believe the Scripture, that Christ is come to destroy the works of the devil, of which this despondency is one." This joyful and confident view of the infinite fulness of a Saviour's love, instead of that terrifying conception of him as a merciless judge and executioner, which he had hitherto entertained, constitutes the radical difference between the Catholic and the Protestant religion as a matter of experience. In the one, good works are sought as a recommendation to Christ, and these, though imperfect, are graciously accepted and rewarded, so that faith itself is nothing but a work of righteousness, beginning in the intellect and the outward act, and gradually becoming spiritual; in the other, Christ meets the sinner as a sinner, and takes the load himself, shows his adaptedness to just such cases; gives, of his own accord, a penitent and believing heart, and forgives gratuitously, and unites the soul to himself by faith, which is justifying only by virtue of this union.

It was a long time before Luther's mind was clear on this subject. The theory of the scholastic divines and the practice of the church had grown up with him. The new tendency, which began to make its appearance, was suppressed and hemmed in on every side. No expression in the Bible was more terrific to him than that of "the righteousness of God." The fathers had explained it as that attribute of justice by which God executes judgment. "This interpretation," says Luther, "caused me distress and terror when I was a young theologian. For when I heard God called righteous, I ran back in my thoughts to that interpretation which had become fixed and rooted in me by long habit.... So powerful and pestilent a thing is false and corrupt doctrine, when the heart has been polluted with it from youth up." Staupitz and an aged confessor, whose name is not given, taught him that "the righteousness of God," in Paul's epistles, had a very different meaning, namely, that righteousness which becomes the sinner's

the moment he believes in Christ. Referring to this new explanation, he said: "Then I came to understand the matter, and learned to distinguish between the righteousness of the law and the righteousness of the gospel." "When I began," says he again, "to meditate more diligently upon the words 'righteous,' and 'righteousness of God,' which once made me fear when I heard them, and when I considered the passage in the second chapter of Habakkuk, 'The just shall live by faith,' and began to learn that the righteousness which is acceptable to God is revealed without the deeds of the law, from that very time how my feelings were changed! and I said to myself, If we are made righteous by faith, if the righteousness which avails before God, is saving to all who believe in it, then such declarations ought not to alarm the poor sinner and his timid conscience, but rather be to them a consolation." In another place he says, "I had the greatest longing to understand rightly the Epistle of Paul to the Romans, but was always stopped by the word 'righteousness,' in the 1st chapter and 19th verse, where Paul says, 'the righteousness of God is revealed in the gospel.' I felt very angry at the term, 'the righteousness of God;' for, after the manner of all the teachers, I was taught to understand it, in a philosophic sense, of that righteousness by which God is just and punishes the guilty. Though I was a man without reproach, I felt myself a great sinner before God, and was of a very quick conscience, and had not confidence in a reconciliation with God, to be produced by any work of satisfaction or merit of my own. For this cause I had in me no love of a righteous and angry God, but secretly hated him, and said to myself, Is it not enough that God has condemned us to everlasting death by Adam's sin, and that we must suffer so much trouble and misery in this life? Over and above the terror and threatening of the law, must he, by the gospel, increase our misery and anguish; and, by the preaching of the same, thunder against us his justice and fierce wrath? My confused conscience ofttimes cast me into fits of anger, and I sought, day and night, to make out the meaning of Paul; and, at last, I came to apprehend it thus: Through the gospel is revealed the righteousness which avails with God, a righteousness by which God, in his mercy and compassion, justifies us, as it is written, 'The just shall live by faith.' Straightway I felt as if I were born anew; it was as if I had found the door of Paradise thrown wide open. Now I saw the Scriptures in an entirely new light, ran through their whole contents, as far as my memory could reach, and compared them, and found that the righteousness was the more surely that by which he makes us righteous, because everything agreed therewith so well. . . . The expression, 'the righteousness of God,'

which I so much hated before, became now dear and precious, my favorite and most comforting word; and that passage of Paul was, to me, the true door of Paradise."

This long passage is one of the most interesting to be found in all Luther's writings. Though we are rarely able to positively state the moment of one's conversion, we may confidently affirm that this paragraph refers us distinctly to the time when the scales fell from Luther's eyes, and when he broke through that complicated and strong net-work of papal error which had hitherto held him captive. From this time Luther is a new man. He had a footing of his own, and felt the strength of his foundation. Although he had almost everything to learn in respect to this new land of promise, he knew that he was in it.

Again, we learn to a certainty here, that Luther's own mind labored long and hard upon this point. Nothing can be more erroneous than the impression received by many from the meagre accounts commonly given of this struggle, that a few words, short and simple, of Staupitz speedily set him right. The process was very protracted and complicated, and the fierce contention between two opposite elements was carried on long and extended through all the domain of monasticism, its habits and usages, its Scripture interpretations, its dialectics, and the whole mass of its cumbrous theology. A gigantic effort of intellect was requisite in order that Luther should feel his way out in opposition to all the scholastic and monastic influences, not only without the aid of the original Scriptures, but with a version (the Vulgate) in which the key word to this doctrine of justification was rendered by *justitia*, justice, which, with its false glosses, greatly increased the difficulty.

But we should err, if we were to dilute this great change down to a mere intellectual process. Luther himself viewed it very differently, and always represented it as a spiritual transformation effected by the grace of God. He remarks on this subject, "Staupitz assisted me, or rather God through him. . . . I lay wretchedly entangled in the papal net. . . . I must have perished in the den of murderers, if God had not delivered me. . . . His grace transformed me, and kept me from associating with the enemies of the gospel, and from joining them now in shedding innocent blood." Who can doubt that he spoke from his own experience, when he said, "As soon as you receive the knowledge of Christ with sure faith, all anger, fear and trembling vanish in the twinkling of an eye, and nothing but pure compassion is seen in God! Such knowledge quickens the heart and makes it joyful, and assured that God is not angry with us, but tenderly loves us."

The remainder of the time that Luther spent in Erfurt, that is, the latter part of his third year in the cloister and the little of the fourth that was passed there before going to Wittenberg, was employed in the study of the Christian fathers, and especially the writings of Augustine, in connection with the Scriptures and the doctrine of justification. That it is a mistake to place this study of Augustine and others of the church fathers, except the casual reading of them, at an earlier period, is evident from the account of Melanchthon, who says it took place after he had ascertained the doctrine of justification by faith. With the works of Augustine he became very familiar, and afterwards he edited one of his treatises, to be used as a text-book in the university of Wittenberg. In the preface, he remarks, "I can safely affirm from my own experience, that next to the Holy Scriptures there is no writer of the church who can be compared with Augustine in Christian learning." Another favorite author with Luther at this time was Gerson, with whose moral writings he was particularly pleased, "because he alone of all the writers of the church, treated of spiritual trials and temptations."

ARTICLE X.

TRANSLATION OF THE PROPHECY OF NAHUM WITH NOTES.

By Prof. B. B. Edwards.

Introductory Remarks.

Fresh interest has been given to this Prophecy of late by the excavations that have been made, or which are now making, on or near the site of ancient Nineveh. The late Mr. Rich, British resident at Bagdad, and son-in-law of Sir James Mackintosh, was the first who awakened a deep interest in the ruins which line the banks of the Tigris near Mosul. His excavations were, however, confined to a limited space, directly opposite Mosul, and his discoveries, compared with the more recent, are not of special importance. Within a few years, M. Botta, son of the distinguished Italian historian, a gentleman of learning and of great enterprise, has made extensive researches at the village of Khorsabad, on the great plain, about twelve miles

N. E. of Mosul. He had at first little to encourage him except his own individual zeal and patience. At length, however, the French government lent their efficient patronage, and sent M. Flandin, an accomplished artist, who took exact copies of the more important sculptures and paintings which had been brought to light. In the meantime, Mr. Layard, an Englishman, labored with great enthusiasm and success at a point on the east bank of the Tigris, about twenty miles below Mosul, called Nimrood. Mr. Layard has lately spent a number of months in London, bringing a port-folio of 279 drawings. The sculptures which he collected are deposited in the British Museum. While in Paris he showed his drawings to M. Felix Lajard, and the collection was compared with that of M. Botta. M. Lajard maintains that the Nimrood bas-reliefs are older by several centuries than those at Khorsabad, and that from their resemblance to Persepolitan symbols, they belong to the worship of Mithra, i. e. Astarte or Mylitta. A volume, containing the results of Mr. Layard's discoveries, is now in the press in London, while the author is on his return to the scene of his labors. The date of the ruins is still a mystery. As a proof of their extreme antiquity, it is stated that the earliest buildings in Nimrood were buried, and that the earth which had accumulated over them, was used as a cemetery 700 B. C. Mr. Layard conjectured that the buildings dated from 1200 B. C. The rooms were lined with slabs of marble, covered with bas-reliefs. The door-ways were flanked by winged figures of greater height than the slabs; on all these figures was the mark of blood, as if thrown against them and allowed to trickle down. The walls were of sun-dried bricks, and where they rose above the sculptured slabs, they were covered with paintings. The beams, where they remained, were of mulberry. The buildings were provided with a complete system of sewerage, each room having had a drain connected with a main sewer. Among the ruins, a small chamber was discovered, formed of bricks regularly *arched.* Many of the bas-reliefs appeared to have been taken from other buildings and reüsed.[1]

Many of the paintings and sculptures, copied by M. Flandin at Khorsabad, have been carefully engraved at the expense of the late government of France. Through the kindness of a friend, we have been permitted to examine between thirty and forty of these splendid

[1] It is mentioned in the Journals that M. Isidore Löwenstern of Paris, who has made considerable progress in deciphering the Assyrian writings, announces that the name of the king found on the Assyrian monument at Khorsabad is that of Sargon, mentioned in Isa. 20: 1. It is also stated that Maj. Rawlinson and Mr. Layard have recognized, in the same group of letters, the king who built the palace at Khorsabad.

and costly engravings. As works of art they are attractive, but as exact transcripts of the scenes and objects of a hoary antiquity, they are inestimable. They were not accompanied by any letter press or explanations, yet the graphic delineations and strongly marked forms instantly suggest to the observer such biblical passages as the following: "They are terrible and dreadful; their judgment and their dignity shall proceed of themselves." "And they shall scoff at the kings, and the princes shall be a scorn unto them; they shall deride every stronghold, for they shall heap up dust (a mound) and take it." "Whose arrows are sharp, and all their bows bent, their horses' hoofs shall be counted like flint, and their wheels like a whirlwind." "Men portrayed upon the wall, the images of the Chaldeans portrayed with vermilion, girded with girdles upon their loins, exceeding in dyed attire upon their heads, all of them princes to look to, after the manner of the Babylonians of Chaldea, the land of their nativity," etc.

The most obvious impression communicated by these pictures, is the strangeness of the physiognomy of the men—its unlikeness to the races now existing in central Asia. They seem to belong to a race or family now unknown. All the figures indicate great physical development, animal propensities very strongly marked, a calm, settled ferocity, a perfect *nonchalance* amidst the most terrible scenes; no change of feature takes place, whether the individual is inflicting or experiencing horrid suffering. "Their bows also dash the young men to pieces; they have no pity on the fruit of the womb; their eye doth not spare children." The pictures are very remarkable as indicating the entire absence of the higher mental and moral qualities, and the exuberance of the brutal part of man's nature. At the same time, there is not wanting a certain consciousness of dignity and of inherent power. There is a tranquil energy and fixed determination which will not allow the beholder to feel any contempt for these stern warriors. They are ready to march into the thickest danger without the quivering of a muscle. Perhaps the best modern representatives of these old Assyrians are the Koords, though there are strong points of dissimilarity. Most of the existing inhabitants of Central Asia are an effeminate race, very unlike those who scaled the walls of Nineveh or of Tyre. These pictures afford the most melancholy evidence that war was the great business of life. All its horrid concomitants and results are faithfully portrayed. We learn distinctly the nature of the armor offensive and defensive, the method of marching, of hurling the arrow, of thrusting with the lance, of beheading and impaling, of binding captives, of attacking and defending walls and fortresses, of the nature of one of the engines—drawn on two wheels and employed

in making a breach in a wall, of the war-chariot occupied by two or three men, of the gay trappings of the horses, of the exact shape of the boats, and of the way in which they were laden with beams of timber, etc. Some of the costume, particularly that worn by the king or the nobility, is embroidered in quite a tasteful manner, and is worn very gracefully. A long ribbon or streamer, hanging from the back of the head of some of the principal personages, is particularly ornamental. The laws of proportion, of perspective, etc. seem not to have been understood. There is also a sameness and uniformity in the figures which betray the infancy of the art.

In the meanwhile, the student of history and of the Old Testament will anticipate with earnest interest the publication of the remaining engravings of M. Botta, with the accompanying explanations, together with the details of the labors of Messrs. Rawlinson, Layard and others.

Nineveh and the Assyrian Empire.

Nineveh is first mentioned, Gen. 10: 11, 12.[1] From that passage it seems that Nimrod went out from Shinar, i. e. the province of Babylon, into Assyria,[2] and founded Nineveh, the city of Rehoboth, Calah and Resen. Nineveh became the capital of the Assyrian empire and the royal residence. It was built on the east bank of the Tigris, opposite the present city of Mosul. It was extended over a large surface and was said to be greater even than Babylon.[3] It was defended by walls, as well as by the waters of the rapid Tigris. As a commercial centre, it was very flourishing, being a convenient *entrepôt* for a vast region east and west. In later times Mosul was called "the door of Irak, the key of Khorasan, and the transit-place of Azerbijan." The first king of Assyria mentioned in the Hebrew Scriptures is Pul, 2 Kings 15: 19, about 770 B. C. He exacted in tribute from Menahem, king of the Ten Tribes, a thousand talents of silver. The second king was Tiglath Pileser, 2 Kings 15: 29. 16: 7—10, in the reign of Ahaz about B. C. 740. He took Damascus, slew the king Rezin, who had formed an alliance with Pekah king of Israel, and carried the Syrians captive, together with a portion of the inhabitants of the north of Palestine. Ahaz purchased a disgraceful peace by sending

[1] נִינְוֵה; Luke 11: 32, *Νινευὶ*; Vulgate, Ninive; in Her., Diod., Strabo, Joseph., etc. *Νῖνος*; in Arabic writers نينوى; on the Egypt. Monu., NNIA or NNIE, *Ges. Thesaur.*

[2] In order to translate אַשּׁוּר thus, the ה— local is not needed. See Deut. 28: 16. 1 Kings 11: 17.

[3] Diod. II. 3. 7; Her. I. 193, II. 150; Jonah 1: 2. 3: 3. 4: 11.

to the Assyrian monarch the treasures of the temple and of the king's house. Under Shalmaneser, about 720 B. C., the Assyrian empire attained its highest prosperity. About 721 B. C., in the ninth year of Hoshea and the sixth of Hezekiah, he took Samaria, after a siege of three years, and "carried Israel captive into Assyria, and placed them in Halah and in Habor by the river of Gozan and in the cities of the Medes," 2 Kings 17: 6. The fourth king was Sargon, who appears to have reigned between Shalmaneser and Sennacherib. Shalmaneser was king at least up to the year 718 B. C. Sennacherib must have ascended the throne at the latest in 714. Consequently for Sargon's reign we have the interval between 718 and 714 B. C. At this time Egypt seems to have been overrun by the Assyrians and Thebes (No-Ammon) utterly destroyed. See Isa. xx. and Nah. 3: 8—10. The fifth king, Sennacherib, marched against Jerusalem in the 14th year of Hezekiah. The tribute, which was given him by the Jewish king, failed to divert him from his purpose, 2 Kings 18: 14 sq. The imminent danger was averted by a miracle, for "the angel of the Lord smote in the camp of the Assyrians a hundred and fourscore and five thousand." The king returned to Nineveh and while paying his worship to his god Nisroch, was assassinated by two of his sons. A third son, Esarhaddon, succeeded him, Isa. 37: 37, 38. 2 Kings 19: 37. In his reign, Merodach Baladan, king of Babylon, and a vassal of Assyria, attempted to make himself independent. The effort was unsuccessful, and Babylon was made directly dependent on Assyria. It seems to have been in Esarhaddon's reign, that Manasseh was carried a prisoner to Babylon, 2 Chron. 33: 11. Under the successors of Esarhaddon, the Assyrian power rapidly sunk. According to Herodotus I. 102, an ineffectual attempt was made by the Median king Phraortes to take Nineveh. He perished together with his army. According to the same historian, I. 103, 106, Cyaxares the Median, made another attempt on Nineveh, perhaps between the years 633 and 630 B. C., but his design was frustrated in consequence of an invasion of Media by the Scythians. About the year 606, Nineveh was taken after a three years' siege by the combined forces of Cyaxares and of Nabopolassar, viceroy of Babylon.[1]

[1] "The overthrow of Nineveh has been commonly placed B. C. 625, after Nabopolassar, 630, had made himself independent. See Winer Realwörterbuch, II. 188. It is certainly in favor of this reckoning, that Nabopolassar, according to Berosus, reigned twenty-one years, and that it would be in itself probable, that the conquest of the capital of the empire, if it were not introductory to the usurpation of Nabopolassar, would immediately follow it. But according to Her. I. 103, 106, Cyaxares, in his first attack on Nineveh, was interrupted by the invading Scythians, and actually took Nineveh twenty-eight years later; then, as Hupfeld has

Time in which the Prophecy was delivered.

The time in which Nahum uttered his predictions against Nineveh, appears to have been, without much doubt, in the latter part of the reign of Hezekiah. The arguments by which this opinion are supported by Vitringa, Hävernick and others are as follows:

1. The prophet presupposes, not merely the deportation of the Ten Tribes, 2: 2, but also the expedition of Sennacherib against Judah. There seem to be manifest allusions to the circumstances of that expedition and to contemporary events. Assyria has overrun Judah, 1: 15; the latter is suffering grievous oppression, 1: 12, 13. Isa. 37: 3. Assyria has proudly risen up against Jehovah, 1: 9, 11; comp. Rabshakeh's words, Isa. 36: 17—20. 37: 17. An event of so much importance as the invasion of Sennacherib would naturally lead to the utterance of a prophecy. The Assyrian had publicly defied Jehovah near mount Zion itself, and had insolently dared him to defend his chosen seat. A summary excision of such a foe might be expected to follow.

2. According to Nahum's description, Assyria was at the summit of its power; as it appears in Isaiah, Nah. 1: 12. 2: 1, Nineveh is still the mistress of nations, full of deeds of insatiable violence. But after Sennacherib's reign, this state of things did not exist. Esarhaddon's government exhibits the final struggles of the empire to recover its former glory. At Nahum's time, Assyria must have been in a very prosperous condition; otherwise the strong and explicit statements of the prophet would have lacked truth. Zephaniah, a later prophet, refers only briefly to the earlier predictions. Zeph. 2: 13—15.

3. The manner in which Nahum expresses himself, in relation to Judah, accords with the circumstances of Hezekiah, comp. 1: 7, "Good is Jehovah, a refuge in the day of trouble," etc. This confident trust in God was very conspicuous in the days of this pious king. An apostasy of the theocracy is nowhere alluded to by Nahum. The enemies of the covenant people are the enemies of Jehovah, 1: 11. The Assyrian invasion is not described as a punishment

---

rightly reckoned, if Cyaxares ascended the throne B. C. 633, and Nineveh was first attacked between 633 and 630, its destruction after a three years' siege would take place in 606." That the destruction of Nineveh was not accomplished exclusively by the Medes, follows from the notices of Abydenus and Alex. Polyhistor, who speak of a preceding alliance of the Chaldeans with the Medes. The silence of Ctesias, Diod. and others has not much weight in opposition to this view, as they wholly omit the *Chaldean* dynasty which intervened between the Assyrian and Medo-Persian."—*Delitzsch Habb. Introd. p.* 18.

of the Jews. Distinguished blessings are to follow the destruction of the enemy, 2: 13. This description corresponds well with the reign of Hezekiah, particularly the last part of it. There is no internal evidence in favor of the theory of a later authorship in the time of Manasseh.

4. The prophet does not name the enemies of Assyria who are commissioned to effect her overthrow. The place whence they shall come to the attack is never mentioned, only in general the enemy is described as a terrible and irresistible power, 2: 4 sq. This may imply that that total destruction of Nineveh, which he depicts with the utmost assurance, is not near, is fixed somewhere in a period somewhat distant.

The prophet, 3: 8, refers to No-Ammon, the Egyptian Thebes, as already destroyed—a city stronger and more affluent than Nineveh. When and by whom this destruction was effected cannot be with certainty ascertained. From Isa. chap. xx. it would appear that Tartan, leader of the forces of Sargon, king of Assyria, overrun Egypt. The reign of Sargon is, with great probability, placed between the reign of Shalmaneser and that of Sennacherib, i. e. 718—714 B. C. It would seem that Shalmaneser had determined to invade Egypt, but was detained by the siege of Tyre. His plan was carried out by Sargon. It seems to have been in this expedition, probably about 716, that Thebes was destroyed.

Native Place of Nahum.

The word הָאֶלְקֹשִׁי, in the inscription, does not refer to the family of the prophet, but to the place of his birth or abode. So Elijah the Tishbite, 1 Kings 17: 1, Micah the Morasthite, Jer. 26: 18. In regard to the situation of Elkosh, two theories have prevailed. The word does not appear elsewhere in the Old Testament, but is first found in the Christian Fathers. Elkosh, in Assyria, is situated on the east bank of the Tigris, three hours, or about 12 miles above Mosul.[1] The grave of the prophet, to which the Jews now make pilgrimages, is still pointed out. Against the supposition that the prophet resided here, it may be urged, 1st. That in the province of Assyria (Koordistan), where this Elkosh is situated, none of the Jewish captives, so far as we know, were carried. They were placed in the territories, then recently conquered by Assyria, e. g. Mesopotamia, Media, etc. The passages in Tobit, 1: 18, etc. prove nothing

[1] See Assem. Bib. Orient. I. p. 525, III. 352, Niebuhr's Arabien II. S. 352, Rich's Koordistan II. p. 110.

to the contrary. 2d. Nahum, in his prophecy, makes no reference to Hebrew exiles in Assyria, among whom, it is alleged, he lived. He was not wanting in patriotism, love of country and zeal for the theocracy. But there is no mention of any return to Judah, or of the sad circumstances so frequently occurring in the prophets of the exile. 3d. The testimonies in favor of the other Elkosh, as the abode of the prophet, are earlier and more important than those for the Assyrian. 4th. The prophecy itself furnishes no evidence that its author was in a foreign land. The allegation of Ewald [1] and others that the vividness and minuteness of some of the descriptions, presuppose that the author was an eye-witness, cannot have much weight. These life-like delineations only show the warmth of the prophet's feelings, and the vigor of his inspired imagination. Besides, they have parallels in the descriptions of other prophets who never saw what they portray.

The other Elkosh, according to the statements of some of the fathers,[2] was a village in Galilee. After his countrymen were carried captive by the Assyrians, the prophet might still have continued to reside here, or, what is more probable, have removed into Judah. He often refers in his prophecy to Judah, e. g. 1: 9, 12. 2: 1. It is not necessary to suppose that he lived in Assyria, to account for a few peculiarities in his language, as Ewald supposes. The words and phrases in question might have been current in the north of Palestine, or they may have been peculiarities of the prophet's style.

Style and Manner of Nahum.

The perfect unity of the book is obvious at first view. One object only—the overthrow of Nineveh—is pursued from the beginning to the end. The general declarations, the historical allusions, the figures of speech, are all made to conspire to one purpose. There is, also, if we may so say, perfect unity of emotion. Feelings of exultation at the certain destruction of the enemy, and consequent happy state of his country, the firmest trust in God as the unchangeable enemy of the wicked and the friend of the good, pervade the prophet's breast and

---

[1] Die Propheten d. A. Bundes I. S. 149. Comp. Hitzig Kleine Propheten S. 213.

[2] The most important testimony is that of Jerome: Elcese usque hodie in Galilaea viculus sit, parvus quidem, et vix ruinis veterum aedificiorum indicans vestigia, sed tamen notus Judaeis et mihi quoque a circumducente monstratus. *Prol. Comm. ad Nahum.* See also, Euseb. in Onomast., Cyrill. Alex. ad Nah. 1: 1. Isodor. Hisp. c. 47.

deeply color all his words. A prophetic ardor, a sustained enthusiasm, characterize the entire composition. No prosaic clauses intervene to break up the unity of thought.

Another marked quality is the graphic coloring, the picturesqueness of the entire representation. Everything lives and breathes. The writer introduces us into the midst of the scenes which he sketches, as if he were an ear and eye witness. There is perhaps no passage in the Old Testament, of equal length, which so glows with life. This vividness of coloring is owing to a variety of causes. There is great brevity of expression. No unnecessary terms are employed. The verb and the noun are prominently introduced; the less important parts of speech, e. g. the connectives, are, as far as possible, dispensed with. Nothing is inserted which will impede the torrent of emotion. Again, the transitions are extremely rapid and unexpected. The poet rushes impetuously from one object to another in the thickening drama. It is now the avenging Deity, now the gleaming armor of the Medians, the despairing monarch, the palace burst open, and Judah exulting at the joyful tidings. The writer sometimes withholds the subject, inserting a pronoun without an antecedent, leaving the reader to infer what is skilfully concealed. Nineveh, the sole theme of the poem, is not mentioned till the ninth verse of the second chapter. Rhetorical rules are neglected; there is no logical sequence in the thoughts. There is no formal statement of what the writer proposes to illustrate. All these things would abate from the life of the description and the depth of the impression. Indeed, they would be wholly inconsistent with the prophet's state of mind. Inexpressible emotions fill his soul at the deliverance of the house of David and at the remediless destruction of the insolent foe. His imagination, too, kindred to that of Isaiah, multiplies felicitous imagery, some of it of the boldest and most striking character. At the same time, in this impetuous movement, there is nothing confused, or overdrawn, or extravagant. A beautiful, though poetic order pervades the entire composition. The style is dignified, the parallelisms, and the whole outward frame-work are carefully preserved.

In grandeur of style, in condensed energy, in elevation of sentiment and rapid transitions, and in a certain completeness of representation, Nahum stands, if not the very first, yet near the very first of the Hebrew prophets. In some respects, Isaiah leaves all the others behind him. In originality of thought, in freshness and variety of metaphors, in ability to maintain himself long at a lofty height, in a wonderful variety of style, and in an evangelic spirit, comprehensive as Christianity itself, Isaiah stands preëminently the first. Nahum and Ha-

bakkuk, with all their splendor of thought and vigor of style, repeat, to some extent, the thoughts and images of earlier writers. Yet both, viewed merely as poets, and separate from inspiration, have that creative imagination, "the gift and faculty divine," granted to few of our race. Both have nearly an unmatched sublimity, the greatest impetuosity of movement, united with true dignity, overflowing emotion, together with the most suggestive brevity. In them, the fire of the earliest poets glows in undiminished power.

General Outline of the Argument.

The prophecy is, not unnaturally, separated into three parts, according to the division of the chapters. Chapter I. represents Jehovah as the avenging God, who, though long-suffering, lets nothing go unpunished. The Almighty, whom none can withstand, will at length utterly destroy the city from which the enemy comes. Thus the yoke laid on his people will be broken, while the oppressor hopelessly perishes. In chapter II, with a pencil of light, the prophet paints the particulars. The successive acts of the great drama pass rapidly before our eyes. No obstructions, no hindrances are of any avail. Leaving out of view all intermediate objects and scenes, the poet hastens to the final catastrophe. The city is in ruins; distant and oppressed Judah exults at the tidings. In chapter III. we have, in part, and in a calmer style, a representation of the same scenes. Nineveh, in her terrible overthrow, suffers nothing more than she deserves. Her security was misplaced, her confidence in her bulwarks was vain; for Thebes, a city of much greater strength and resources, had fallen. So all the defences on which Nineveh had relied, will prove utterly unavailing.

The following division of the prophecy into seven strophes or paragraphs, will present the course of thought in a more specific form:

I. Ch. I. vs. 2—8. "Nahum begins, very beautifully, with a sentiment which underlies the whole prophecy, and which almost reveals what the sequel is. He describes those attributes of Jehovah by which Nineveh's overthrow will be effected." In vs. 4, 5, a theophany, or actual appearance of Jehovah, is delineated, with its terrible effects. Before this Divine wrath, which burns like devouring fire, none can stand. Yet the righteous have nothing to fear, for God is benignant to them, while he brings on his enemies remediless destruction.

II. Vs. 9—14. Consequently, it is folly to oppose such a God. The judgments which he will inflict on the Assyrians, who have proudly risen up against him, will be complete and final. The power on which they rely, however great, will be of no avail. By their overthrow, a signal deliverance will be accomplished for the

chosen people. Judah will have nothing to fear in future from the foe, as he will be extirpated root and branch.

III. Ch. II. vs. 1—11. The prophet stations himself at the end of the catastrophe. On the mountains which separate Assyria from Judah are seen the feet of the messenger, hastening to spread the joyful tidings. No more will the solemn feasts be interrupted by the insulting foe. He will no more attack Judah, for he must now defend himself. The invader is on his march. Instantly must Nineveh summon all her energies, and employ every means of defence. Yet her utmost exertions will be of no avail, for the invading army is only executing Jehovah's design of restoring the glory of Judah, so that it may equal the former glory of Israel. The hosts of the invaders are drawing near, with their glittering armor and waving lances. The war-chariots, gleaming with iron, rush through the broad streets. The besieged, losing all courage, make a fruitless defence. The city is stormed, the royal palace is carried; a wretched captivity awaits the survivors; the city is given up to universal pillage, and becomes a waste.

IV. The prophet, in vision, stands on the site of the desolated Nineveh and asks, with a mixture of joy and wonder, Where is this city, lately so famous as the seat of luxury and wealth, acquired by deeds of violence and rapine? The lion's lair is destroyed; the ill-gotten wealth is utterly dissipated; the means for foreign conquest exist no more; all the resources of the State have vanished.

V. Ch. III. vs. 1—7. When the prophet had declared the certainty of the fall of Nineveh, he proceeds to give the reasons for it. It is a wicked city, full of deeds of violence. Her sins have brought upon her a deserved fate. Like a harlot, who seeks by every means to entrap the unwary, and thus promote her flagitious designs, so Nineveh augmented her wealth and power by fraud or open violence. To accomplish her objects, she paid no regard to the laws of morality or humanity. And as an abandoned prostitute was sometimes punished by a shameful exposure of her person in a public place, so Nineveh is an object of contempt and loathing to all who look upon her desolations.

VI. Vs. 8—14. The prophet now adopts a calmer mode of representation. To show the vain confidence of the Assyrians, and their folly in trusting to their great resources, he institutes a comparison between Nineveh and No-Ammon, or the Egyptian Thebes. The latter was a city of far greater strength, impregnable, as she fancied, by natural position, by artificial defences, and by hosts of allies. Yet she fell, and her wretched inhabitants were subjected to all the horrors of war and captivity. So the walls and towers of Nineveh would be no defence; they would fall like unripe fruit, while her cowardly defenders would only seek a refuge from present danger.

VII. Vs. 14—19. The prophet concludes with a paragraph of cutting irony, showing the necessity of the overthrow of Nineveh. He counsels her to provide an ample store of water for the siege, and carefully repair and fortify her walls—all will be in vain. Fire and sword shall consume thee, like the devouring locust. Though thy people are innumerable, like the locusts, and though those that trade with thee are in number as the stars of heaven, yet thy wealth will be like the locusts when warmed by the sun; it will take to itself wings and fly away. The foreign merchants, on the approach of danger, will desert thee. Thy wound is incurable, utter destruction awaits thee. All the cities and nations that have felt thy oppressing power, will exult over thee in the day of thy destruction.

Translation.

I. 1. Sentence against Nineveh!
Book of the Vision of Nahum, the Elkoshite.

I.

2. An angry God and avenging is Jehovah;
Jehovah avengeth and is full of wrath;
Jehovah taketh vengeance on his adversaries,
And he keepeth anger for his enemies.
3. Jehovah is long-suffering, yet great in power,
And he will not at all let go unpunished;
Jehovah—in the whirlwind and the storm is his way,
And clouds are the dust of his feet.
4. He rebuketh the sea and drieth it up,
And all the rivers he maketh dry;
Bashan languisheth and Carmel,
And the bloom of Lebanon fadeth.
5. The mountains tremble before him,
And the hills melt,
And lifted up is the earth at his presence,
And the world and all that dwell therein!
6. Before his indignation who can stand?
And who can rise up in the burning of his anger!
His wrath is poured out like fire,
And the rocks are torn down before him.
7. Good is Jehovah, a Refuge in the day of distress,
And he knoweth those trusting in him.
8. But with an overwhelming flood, an end he will make of her place, [Nineveh],
And his enemies darkness shall pursue.

II.

9. What do ye [Assyrians] devise against Jehovah?
An end he maketh,
A second time, distress shall not arise;
10. For, as thorns entangled,
And as with their wine drunken,
They shall be consumed as stubble fully dry.

11. From thee [Nineveh] went forth he that devised evil against Jehovah,
That counselled iniquity.
12. Thus saith Jehovah:
"Though complete and so very many,
Yet thus they shall be cut off, and he shall pass away.
Though I have afflicted thee [Judah],
I will not afflict thee more;
13. And now I will break his yoke from off thee,
And his bonds I will burst."
14. But of thee [Assyria] hath Jehovah commanded,
"That no more of thy name shall be sown,
From the house of thy gods I will cut off the carved image and the molten image,
I will make thy grave, for thou art vile."

III.

II. 1. Lo! on the mountains the feet of him that bringeth good tidings,
That proclaimeth peace,
"Celebrate, O Judah, thy festivals,
Pay thy vows,
For there shall no more pass through thee the destroyer,
He is utterly cut off."
2. There cometh up the waster against thee [Nineveh],
Guard the fortress,
Look out on the way,
Strengthen the loins,
Confirm [thy] power to the utmost,
3. For Jehovah restores the glory of Jacob as the glory of Israel,
For the spoilers have spoiled them,
And their vine-branches they have laid waste.
4. The shield of their heroes [invaders] is red,
The men of might are in crimson,
With the flashing of steel is the war-chariot when arrayed,
And the cypress spears wave to and fro.
5. In the streets rage the chariots,
They run up and down on the broad ways;
Their visage is like torches;
As lightnings they run.
6. He [the Assyrian king] remembers his mighty ones;
They stumble on their way;
They [the invaders] hasten to her wall,
And the mantlet is set in order;

7. The gates of the rivers are opened,
And the palace is dissolved.
8. It is fixed! She [Nineveh] is uncovered, she is led away,
And her maidens pant as the voice of doves, beating on their breasts.
9. And Nineveh was like a pool of waters of old;
Yet they flee: "Stand! stand!" but no one looketh back;
10. Seize the silver! seize the gold!
And there is no end to the treasure;
Abundance of all costly vessels.
11. Desolation! devastation! and destruction!
And the heart melts, and there is a tottering of the knees,
And pangs in all loins, and all faces gather redness.

IV.

12. Where is the dwelling of the lions?
And the feeding-place of the young lions?
Where the lion walked, the lioness, the lion's whelp,
And none scared them away?
13. The lion rends for his whelps,
And strangles for his lionesses,
And fills with prey his holes,
And his lairs with ravin.
14. Lo! I am against thee, saith Jehovah of hosts,
And I will burn in the smoke her chariots,
And thy young lions the sword shall devour,
And I will cut off from the earth thy prey,
And no more shall be heard the voice of thy messengers!

V.

III. 1. Wo! city of blood!
The whole of her with lies and violence is full;
She doth not give up the prey.
2. The sound of the whip,
And the noise of the rattling of the wheel,
And the prancing horse and the bounding chariot,
3. The horseman causeth his horse to prance,
And there is the flame of the sword and the lightning of the lance,
And a multitude of the slain,
And abundance of corpses,
And no end to the dead bodies,
They stumble over their dead bodies.

4. Because of the fornications of the harlot,
   The graceful beauty, the mistress of enchantments,
   Who selleth the nations by her whoredoms,
   And the people with her sorceries.
5. "Lo! I am against thee, saith Jehovah of hosts!
   And I will uncover thy skirts before thy face,
   And I will cause the nations to see thy nakedness,
   And the kingdoms thy shame.
6. And I will cast upon thee abominations,
   And I will disgrace thee,
   And will set thee as a gazing stock;
7. And it shall come to pass that every one that seeth thee, shall flee from thee,
   And shall say, 'Perished is Nineveh,
   Who shall bewail her?
   Whence shall I seek comforters for thee?"'

VI.

8. Art thou better than No-Ammon,
   Who dwelt by the rivers,
   The waters were round about her,
   Whose fortress was the sea,
   Of sea was her wall,
9. Cush was her strength, and Egypt, numbers without end;
   Put and the Libyans were thy allies.
10. Even she into captivity went with the captives,
    Also her children were dashed in pieces at the head of every street,
    And upon thy honorable men they cast lots,
    And all thy nobles were bound in fetters.
11. Thou also shalt be drunken,
    Thou shalt hide thyself,
    Even thou shalt seek a refuge from the enemy.
12. All thy fortresses are fig-trees, with the first-ripe fruit,
    If they are shaken, they fall into the mouth of the eater.
13. Lo! thy people are women in the midst of thee;
    To thy enemies wide opened shall be the gates of thy land;
    The fire shall consume thy bars.

VII.

14. Water for the siege draw for thee,
Strengthen thy fortifications,
Enter into the clay
And tread upon the loam,
And make strong the brick-kiln;
15. Then the fire shall consume thee,
The sword shall cut thee off,
It shall eat thee as the locust.
Make thyself great as the locust,
Multiply thyself like the young locust,
16. Enlarge thy merchants like the stars of heaven,
The locust shall spread his wings and fly away.
17. Thy princes are like the young locust,
Thy satraps like locust-swarms;
They alight on the walls in the day of cold,
The sun ariseth and they fly away,
And the place where they were is not known.
18. Thy shepherds slumber, O king of Assyria,
Thy princes sleep,
Scattered are thy people on the mountains,
And there is none that gathereth them;
19. No healing for thy breach,
Incurable is thy wound;
All that hear the report of thee,
Shall clap the hand upon thee,
For upon whom hath not thy wickedness continually passed.

Notes.

Chap. I., verse 1. מַשָּׂא from נָשָׂא is an oracle, divine sentence; Jehovah, not the prophet, is conceived as the subject who utters the oracle. The noun is constructed with the Gen. of the subject, with the Gen. expressing the nature of what is spoken, and, as here, with the Gen. of the object, e. g. מַשָּׂא בָּבֶל, 'sentence against Babylon,' Isa. 13: 1. Röd. Ges. Gr. § 112. 2. The word is generally, but not necessarily, used of an oracle which threatens or denounces judgments, see Isa. 19: 1 compared with 19: 23, 19, where threatenings and promises are addressed to Egypt in one and the same 'oracle.' *Delitzsch's. Habb.* p. 2. חָזוֹן, at the same time in the Gen. and in

Const. state, from חָזוֹן, Divine revelations, visions, which were revealed to the mind of the prophet, that which he saw inwardly, *Knobel Prophetismus*, I. p. 176.

Verse 2. קַנּוֹא, not jealous, impatient of a rival, dissatisfied that divine honors should be paid to another, as in Ex. 20: 5; not merely the zealous interest which he feels for his people and land, Joel 2: 18, but, in a general sense, 'he is angry,' he will not remain indifferent in respect to the commission of great iniquities, any more than to sufferings endured on his account. On the contrary he will take vengeance, Ps. 94: 1. Rev. 6. 10. בַּעַל חֵמָה, lord or possessor of wrath, cómp. master of dreams, Gen. 37: 19, master of causes, Ex. 24: 14, § 104. 2. *a.* After נוֹטֵר supply אַפּוֹ *his anger*, Jer. 3: 5, comp. *φυλάσσειν χόλον* Il. 16: 30. Jehovah is here represented as full of burning anger, which he retains and as it were nourishes, till the time comes to pour it out, Is. 59: 18. "Lento gradu," says Valerius Maximus, "ad vindictam sui divina procedit ira, tarditatemque supplicii gravitate compensat."

Verse 3. Jehovah long endures the provocations of his enemies, Ex. 34: 6. His patience, in respect to the Assyrians, does not arise from want of power to inflict punishment, or from any design of allowing the guilty finally to escape. נַקֵּה Inf. Piel with finite verb, 'absolving he will not absolve,' i. e. he will not at all acquit, § 128. 3. *a.* Ex. 34: 7. In the second member of this verse and in the following, Jehovah is described as coming forth to take vengeance; he no longer retains his wrath. אָבָק, fine dust, Deut. 28: 24. Isa. 29: 4, poet. for clouds on which Jehovah walks.

Verse. 4. גּוֹעֵר, Particip. denoting continued action, shows that the reference is not made to the historical fact of the drying up of the Red Sea, though that may have occasioned the introduction of this feature into the delineation. Comp. "He rebuked the Red Sea and dried it up," Ps. 106: 9. The word means not merely 'chiding,' Luke 8: 24, but the drying up of the waters וַיְבַשֵּׁהוּ Fut. Piel Contract. for וַיְבַשֵּׁחֵהוּ § 68. 3. 6. This Fut., when preceded by a Part., refers to the present time, § 126 *b.* 3. *a.* אָמְלַל to languish, wither, fade, of trees, fields, mountains, etc., not of the stripping off of leaves by a wind, but of the decaying and falling of them through the effects of a drought. 'Bloom of Lebanon.' "He shall cast forth his roots as *Lebanon*;" "The scent thereof shall be as the wine of Lebanon," Hos. 14: 5, 7. Bashan and Carmel were greatly distinguished for fruitfulness and verdure.

Verse 5. The phenomena here alluded to are not those caused by an earthquake, but by a tempest, Ps. 29: 6. הִנָּפְנוּ before him, from

his presence; verbs of fearing, trembling, guarding against, etc. are connected with מִן of the person whom we fear, from whom we flee, etc., Isa. 6: 4, comp. *καλύπτω ἀπὸ*, וַתִּשָּׂא Intrans., lifts up, arises, Ps. 89: 10, 'when its waves lift up themselves;' Is. 13: 13, 'and the earth trembles from her place;' Ps. 29: 8, the ground trembles by the reverberations of the thunder.

Verse 6. Before the terrors of God's wrath, who can stand? For the Lord thy God is a consuming fire, Deut. 4: 24. "The word of the Lord as a fire breaketh the rock in pieces," Jer. 23: 29. 10: 10. The pouring out of the Divine wrath is frequently compared to fire, Jer. 7: 20. 2 Chron. 34: 25.

Verse 7. "By the very emphatic expressions of verses 6 and 8," says Hitzig, "the beauty of the intermediate verse is placed in a clearer light." Comp. Jer. 16: 19; Ps. 46: 2.

Verse 8. "By an overrunning flood," i. e. by hostile armies. In Isa. 8: 8, the power of Assyria is compared to the inundating Euphrates. Isa. 28: 15. כָּלָה, perfection, consummation, utter destruction, 'ad internecionem delevit,' Luth. das Garaus machen. 'Her place,' i. e. Nineveh. Imperceptibly the prophet leaves his general, introductory thought, and now comes upon his great theme, the remediless doom of Nineveh.

Verse 9. The danger is imminent, the destruction is certain on two grounds, 1. vs. 9, 10, Jehovah has determined it. What do ye imagine? That God will trifle with the matter, or that he cannot execute his will? Oh! no. What he determines to do, he will do effectually. He does not need, like man, to repeat his act. The first assault of the invading army, his agent, will be final. 2. vs. 11, 12, because there has gone out from Nineveh that impious man (e. g. Sennacherib), who plotted against Jehovah, and proudly defied his power, *Ewald in loc.*

Verse 10. A repetition of the act will not be needed, כִּי *for* the Assyrians are hopelessly entangled and defenceless. They are woven together as thorns, and inebriated as with their wine; they shall be burned as dry stubble. So great is their perplexity, so bereft of reason are they, that they will be quickly and utterly destroyed. עַד, used in comparisons, *up to*, *equal to*, e. g. "Their family did not increase עַד up to, the children of Judah," 1 Chron. 4: 27, "Eo usque, ut spinas perplexitate aequent." מְלֵא used adverbially, Jer. 12: 6.

Verse 11. "From thee, (Fem. suffix) Nineveh, or Assyria goes out one who devises evil," etc. king of Assyria, or e. g. Sennacherib, better in a collective sense, kings go out. Hitzig adopts the forced interpretation of יָצָה, etc. "Thou, queen of Nineveh, hast borne him."

Verse 12. The confident expectation which the prophet expresses in vs. 10, 11, in his own name, Jehovah confirms in vs. 12—14. However powerful the Assyrians were in numbers and resources, all would be unavailing, Isa. 16: 14. שְׁלֵמִים, integri, incolumes, with all their powers unimpaired, Gen. 33: 18, and so numerous, ever so many; the second כֵּן means *thus, so, in that condition of prosperity.* Köster, Erläuter. d. heil. Schrift, p. 64, translates, "*so* as I have determined," etc. גָּזַז is used of the shearing of sheep, of the cutting off of the hair, and of cutting grass. In Isa. 7: 20 is the same figurative language, "Jehovah shall shave with a hired razor," etc. עָבַר, each one of them shall disappear, perish. The last part of the verse gives a consoling promise to Judah that the days of her affliction were ended; not, as some translate, "I will afflict thee, Assyrian, so that it will not be necessary to repeat the stroke."

Verse 13. Among other burdens imposed on Judah by the Assyrians, was the tribute paid by Hezekiah, 2 K. 18: 14, of three hundred talents of silver and thirty talents of gold.

Verse 14. צִוָּה placed first by emphasis, "no more sown, propagated," i. e. thy house shall be wholly cut off; no particular individual seems to be here referred to, but Assyria, personified, is addressed, Amos 2: 2. Some, referring the passage to Sennacherib, translate: "I will make it, i. e. thy temple, thy grave, since thou art light, worthless, of no account."

Chap. II. Verse 1. The messengers are not first summoned, as in Isa. 40: 9, but the prophet already sees them on the mountains which separate Assyria from Judah. The exhortation to the Jewish people to resume their customary festivals, etc., implies that Nineveh was not merely menaced, but taken, and that the victory was complete. It would appear, also, from this passage, as well as from the narrative in the historical books, that the Jews had suffered great calamities from the Assyrians during the early part of Hezekiah's reign, as one effect of which the religious rites had been suspended, etc.

Verse 2. Judah has no more to fear from the Assyrians. They are now called to defend themselves against a terrible foe, who is already marching against them. מְפִיץ, *malleus*, one who scatters, destroys, "How is the hammer," king of Babylon, "of the whole earth cut asunder and broken!" Jer. 50: 23. עַל־פָּנַיִךְ, *adversus*, against thee, Ps. 21: 13. נְצוֹר etc. lit. guard the guard, defend the defence, Inf. for emphat. Imp. § 128. 4. *b*, *γ*, addressed ironically by the prophet to Nineveh, 'Watch the way,' send out spies, who shall observe on what road the enemy is advancing.

Verse 3. The reason of the overthrow of Nineveh, or more im-

mediately, the need that she should summon all her forces in self-defence is, כִּי, *that* Jehovah is about to restore to Judah such glory as was formerly enjoyed by Israel. 'Jacob,' see Obad. v. 18, where Joseph is put for Judah. שָׁב causative i. q. Hiphil.

Verse 4. In vs. 4, 5, the invader rapidly draws near; the crimson shield, the gleaming chariot, the trembling lance can be discovered; the sound of the war-chariot can be heard, as it rolls over the broad ways, or as it dashes by with the speed of lightning. מְאָדָם for vowel under א, see § 51. 2. 4; Virg. Æn. 2. 734, ardentes clypeos atque aera micantia cerno. מְתֻלָּעִים clothed in crimson garments, the color derived from the coccus insect. "It was necessary," says Aelian, Var. Hist. 6. 6, "to enter into battle clothed in purple, that the color might denote a certain dignity, and if drops of blood from wounds were sprinkled on it, it became terrible to the enemy," comp. Isa. 9; 5. אֵשׁ־פְּלָדוֹת, perhaps with the gleaming of hooks or scythes on the chariots. "Sometimes the scythe was inserted, parallel to the axle, into the felly of the wheel, so as to revolve, when the chariot was in motion, with more than thrice the velocity of the chariot itself." *Smith's Dict.* Still, it is more probable that the word refers only to the iron or steel armature of the chariots. The suffix in הֲפִינוֹ may refer as Gen. to the leader of the army; or, more probably, as Acc. to הָרֶכֶב, the nearest antecedent. Lances were made of cypress, comp. *μελία* in Hom. and *abies* in Virg. Aen. 11. 667.

Verse 5. Comp. Jer. 46: 9 רְחֹבוֹת places, wide roads, in contrast with the narrow streets in oriental cities.

Verse 6. In the first part of the verse, the vain efforts of the Assyrian king in self-defence are described. He remembers, recals, his nobles, principal officers, whether in the city, or as allies without; he awakes as from a dream when it is too late. They falter on their march, stumble through weakness. In the second member the attacking army are described, not those who are hastening to the defence of the walls; for the connection with the subsequent clause would, in that case, require the mention of a machine for defending the walls, rather than one which is employed by the besiegers. הַסֹּכֵךְ, that which covers, protects, *vinea*, *testudo*, a covering, shed, mantlet was prepared by an army attacking a city, under which the soldiers could approach the walls. "Celeriter vineis ad oppidum actis, aggere jacto, turribusque constitutis," etc. Caes. Bell. Gall. II. 12. The vineae, according to Veget., were machines made of light wood, eight feet high, seven broad, and sixteen long. Comp. Fr. *galleries couvertes*.

Verse 7. The city is stormed and the palace demolished. "Gates of the rivers," says Rosenmüller, "are the gates through which the

enemy rush in, like rivers, inundating all before them," appealing to Isa. 8: 7. Jer. 46: 7, etc. Yet, as Maurer justly remarks, though invading hosts are compared to rivers, yet it by no means follows, that the gates through which an enemy rush, are called the gates of the rivers. The same objection lies against the supposition of Jerome, who understands the gates through which a great multitude of Ninevites were accustomed to go in and out. Others suppose that the city gates are meant, which adjoined the Tigris, or which were in the wall washed by that river; yet that broad and rapid stream would itself be a strong barrier against assault in that quarter. Perhaps the most probable explanation is, that the נְהָרוֹת were canals or ditches, leading from the Tigris to the palace, and that the שַׁעֲרֵי were the city gates near these canals. It is possible that these gates, having been laid under water by the Ninevites, before the assault, were drained off by the enemy, the water being turned into other channels, so that an entrance was effected in the same manner as Cyrus was enabled to march into Babylon. This explanation, though not wholly satisfactory, is encumbered with less difficulty than the others. Possibly light will be thrown on this point by the deciphering of the inscriptions which have been recently copied.

Verse 8. The mournful effects of the capture are described. הֻצַּב can be hardly a proper name for the queen of Nineveh, Huzzab, because it is not the usage of Nahum to mention names, and in this place it would be a lowering in the spirit and tone of the passage. Ges. Thesaurus p. 1147, makes it Hophal from צָבַב, and connects it with the preceding verse, "the palace is dissolved and made to flow down," i. e. is inundated by the Tigris; yet this addition would be superfluous, and contrary to the compressed energy of the prophet's style; נָמוּג would express the whole. The word is Hoph. from נָצַב, 'it is fixed,' it is determined, comp. יַצִּיב Dan. 6: 13; 'uncovered,' ignominiously exposed, comp. Is. 47: 2, 3. הֶעֱלָתָה, for lengthening of vowel of Praeform., see § 62. II. 4. The royal city is exhibited under the image of a queen, and the women of the city are represented as her attendant maidens, mourning over her downfall.

Verse 9. Nineveh, like a pool of waters, has, from its foundation, been the centre of a vast commerce, where there has been an influx of population and riches from all quarters; now the waters dry up, the swarming multitudes disappear. "Stand! stand!" is the summons to the fugitives, but no one halts. "That great city, wherein are more than one hundred and twenty thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand," Jon. 4: 11. From the vast ruins on the eastern bank of the Tigris, extending

above and far below Mosul, this statement of the prophet would not be any hyperbole.

Verse 10. The victors are summoned to plunder the city, with its stores of almost inexhaustible wealth.

Verse 11. The first three words constitute a striking paronomasia. Latin vastitas et vastities et vacuitas, Seventy: ἐκτιναγμὸς, καὶ ἀνατιναγμὸς, καὶ ἐκβρασμὸς. Germ. leer und ausgeleert und verheert; Heb. וּמְשַׁמָּה בְּקָה מְבֻקָּה as a subs. neuter. פְּאַרוּר, *heat*, glow of the countenance, all faces are flushed with terror; others: draw in their glow, grow pale with fear, Joel 2: 6.

Verse 12. In v. 11, the prophet beholds the destruction of the city completed. Now he stands on the desolate site, and asks with a mixture of astonishment, exultation and irony, 'where is the lair of the lion? Where is the den of the young lion? Where is that proud city, which gathered spoil from all nations, which was the seat of wealth and luxury the fruit of extortion and plunder, whose kings and nobles were like ravening beasts of prey? It is utterly destroyed—a mass of shapeless ruins.' אַרְיֵה is the common word for the lion, used in Is. 15: 9, of a ferocious enemy; כְּפִיר, is the young lion, old enough to roar and who is blood-thirsty, distinguished, Ezek. 19: 2, 3, from the גּוּר a whelp; לָבִיא, lioness, so called from לָבָא *to roar.*

Verse 13. בְּדֵי *for* any one, *enough*, commonly where food is mentioned, § 99: 2. טֶרֶף and טְרֵפָה, Masc. and Fem., every kind of prey, comp. Isa. 13: 1, 'every staff of bread,' very common in Arabic, e. g. *feri et ferae*, Ges. Comm. in Is. 1: 194.

Verse 14. repeats or recapitulates the general sentiment or theme of the prophecy = Nineveh is to be destroyed. מַלְאָכֶיהָ, rare form of the Suffix, 2d pers. sing. Masc. § 89, 1. Rem. 2. Jerome: "Thou shalt lay waste the earth no more, neither exact tribute in thy provinces; no more the voice of thy messengers shall be heard." Messengers, i. e. heralds, executors of the royal edicts.

Chap. III. Verse 1. The reason for this utter overthrow is declared. הַדָּם עִיר Asyndic Const., Acc. with מְלֵאָה. פָּרֵק, Ps. 7: 3, rending, breaking in pieces, as a lion. גָּזַל used transitively, the people do not cause the prey to depart, i. e. cease not to plunder. Mich. 3: 3, 4; if intrans., גָּזְלָה or an equivalent would be needed.

Verse 2. In vs. 2, 3, we are brought again into the midst of the contest. The prophet hears the crack of the whip, the rumbling of the wheels, sees the horse proudly prancing, the gleam of the burnished lance, and, as the result, uncounted heaps of the slain. קוֹל not to be supplied before סוּס. The chariot, furnished with small

wheels, and driven rapidly, bounds over the roads. The chariots, which are depicted on the walls at Khorsabad, are low, with two wheels, with one or two persons standing in each, besides the driver; the horses are full of mettle, some of them splendidly caparisoned. מַעֲלֶה, Part. Hiph. The best explanation of this vexed clause is that of Gesenius, viz., the horseman shows off his horse, causes him to prance or rear. Maurer translates 'the horse lifts up himself, shows off proudly,' as in Virg. Georg. 3. 16, "atque equitem docuere sub armis insultare solo."

Verse 4. The reason for the subversion of Nineveh is here given. Like a beautiful and fascinating harlot, the Assyrians had enticed the surrounding nations; by fraudulent treaties, pretended friendships, and various cunning measures, she had entrapped the unwary; she thus obtained a wide dominion and immense resources, by the most unjustifiable means; the passage may also refer to commercial transactions. No means were too bad, no arts too dishonorable, if she could increase her wealth.

Verse 5. The metaphor is continued; Nineveh shall be visited with a punishment similar to that sometimes inflicted on an abandoned female. Is. 47: 13. Jer. 3: 26, "Therefore will I discover thy skirts upon thy face, that thy shame may appear," I will treat thee not as a virtuous matron, but as a shameless prostitute. Jerome: "All these things are represented under the metaphor of an adulterous woman, who, when she was arrested, was brought forward, and before the eyes of all, disgraced."

Verse 6. Men, as they pass by the place where thou stood, shall insult thee, and point at thee the finger of scorn; thou shalt become a gazing-stock, as an unchaste female is exposed to public scorn and infamy.

Verse 7. So low wilt thou fall, so utterly contemptible will thou become, that all that see thee will hasten to escape, exclaiming, 'perished is Nineveh.' יְהֹד Fut. from נָדַד § 75: 1, paronomasia with נָוֹד and שָׁדְדָה.

Verse 8. A free historical illustration, 'Wilt thou share a better fate than No-Ammon, a short time since so great, so strongly fortified by the Nile and its waters, which had such numerous and powerful allies, but which still endured all the horrors of a sacked and plundered city?' תֵּרֻטְבִי for תִּרְטְבִי, Ges. Leghb. p. 388. נֹא־אָמוֹן, the Egyptian Thebes or Diospolis; in Ez. 30: 14, 15, 16. Jer. 46: 25, merely נֹא, called by Homer, *ἑκατόμπυλος*, Il. 9, 383,[1] situated on

[1] "This epithet has been generally supposed to refer to the 100 gates of its wall of circuit; but this difficulty is happily solved by an observation of Diodorus,

both sides of the Nile, about two hundred and sixty miles south of Cairo. It was one hundred and forty stadia in circumference. Its remaining ruins still describe a circuit of twenty-seven miles. The splendor and power of this city, which could furnish 20,000 armed chariots from its vicinity, are to be estimated from the extent of the Egyptian conquests, adding continually to the riches of the metropolis, the magnificence of the edifices which adorned it, the luxuriousness of the individuals who inhabited it, the spoil taken thence by the Persians, and the gold and silver collected after the burning of the city. The principal part of the city lay on the east bank; on the west was the Memnonia and the Necropolis. The most ancient remains, extant at Thebes, are the great temple at Karnak, "the largest and most splendid ruin of which, perhaps, either ancient or modern times can boast." The grand hall measures 170 feet by 329, supported by a central avenue of twelve massive columns, 66 feet high (without the pedestal and abacus) and 12 in diameter; besides 122 of less gigantic dimensions, 41 feet 9 inches in height, and 27 feet 6 inches in circumference. The total length of the temple is 1180 feet. The earliest monarch, whose name exists on the monuments of Thebes is Osirtasen I., the contemporary of Joseph. Sculptures of the earlier Pharaohs have disappeared. In hieroglyphics Thebes is written Ap, Ape, or with the feminine article Tápé, *the head*, Thebes being the *capital* of the country.[2] The date of the origin of Thebes is lost in remote antiquity. The destruction of it, as before remarked, to which Nahum refers, was probably effected by Tartan, Is. xx. It was again captured by Cambyses, 525 B. C. It was finally destroyed by Ptolemy Lathyrus, 81 B. C. Its site is now occupied by several villages. יְאֹרִים an Egyptian word, *canal, fosse*, canals of the Nile, יָם the Nile. "The 'sea,' referred to in this passage, is the river Nile, which, to the present day in Egypt, is named *el-Bahr*, 'the sea,' as its most common appellation."—*Robinson's Researches*, I. p. 542. In Is. 19: 5, יָם is applied to the Euphrates, also Is. 27: 1. Jer. 51: 36. מַיִם *of sea*, composed of sea, the Nile was her wall.

---

that many suppose them 'to have been the propylaea of the temples,' and that this metaphorical expression rather implies a plurality than a definite number; were it not so, the reader might be surprised to learn that this 100-gated city was never enclosed by a wall,—a fact fully proved by the non-existence of the least vestige of it." Even on the supposition that portions of it have been destroyed by inundations, those parts which stood on the rocky and uninundated acclivity would have retained some traces of the former existence of a wall, had there been one.—*Wilkinson's Hand-book for Egypt*, 1847, p. 388.

[2] See Wilkinson's Hand-book, p. 388 seq.

Verse 9. כּוּשׁ, Ethiopia, south of Egypt, a country greatly distinguished in ancient times, for its power, the warlike reputation of its people, etc. Is. 18: 2. מִצְרַיִם is Lower Egypt; פּוּט, the region immediately west of Lower Egypt, adjoining Lybia Proper, whose people were descendants from Ham, Gen. 10: 6, spoken of as forming part of the Egyptian army, Jer. 46: 9. לוּבִים, Lybia Proper, stretching as far as Numidia. That part of Thebes on the west of the Nile was called the Lybian suburb.

Verse 10. The horrible barbarities of war as practised among the ancient nations are here referred to. In one of the historical subjects sculptured at Medeénet Háboo, among other trophies which are delineated, large heaps of hands are placed before the king, which an officer counts one by one, and another notes down their number on a scroll, each heap containing 3000. On another wall, the king, returning victorious to Egypt, proceeds slowly in his car, conducting in triumph the prisoners he has made, who walk beside and before it, three others being bound to the axle. See Hos. 14: 1. זִקִּים bonds, fetters, Seventy: *χειροπέδαις*.

Verse 11. Thou, Nineveh, shalt suffer a fate like that of Thebes. Though now so celebrated, soon thou shalt be cast out and forgotten. נַעֲלָמָה, Fem. Part. Niph., hidden, covered in darkness.

Verse 12. Neither towers, monuments, or mighty armies will be any more defence to thee, than they were to Thebes. They will resemble a fig-tree, from which hang precocious fruits. When the tree is lightly shaken, the figs readily drop.

Verse 13. All courage will be lost. The men, once so daring in war, will become timid and faint-hearted like women. A similar comparison is found in Is. 19: 16, and Jer. 50: 37. "Gates of a land," are the *fauces*, narrow passes, where an enemy can gain an entrance into a country, e. g. Thermopylae in Greece.

Verse 14. Such being the danger, the enemy having already entered the country, the prophet ironically exhorts the Ninevites to prepare everything necessary to sustain a siege—ample provision of water, and also of brick for repairing the walls.

Verse 15. Yet all will be fruitless. With fire and sword shalt thou be destroyed. שָׁם *then*, adverb of time, i. e. 'when the enemy has besieged thee.' יֶלֶק *the feeder*, a short, small locust; Jerome: "Attelabus, a small locust, between an unfledged and full grown locust, with slender wings, creeping rather than flying, ever leaping up, and consuming, in the place where it is produced, everything, even to the dust, for it cannot depart till its wings are grown." By אַרְבֶּה

is probably meant the locust in a still earlier stage of development, when its wings are just appearing, before it is able to fly.[1]

Verse 16. Though the number of those that trade with thee exceed the stars of heaven, they shall disappear, as the locust, when grown, spreads its wings and flies away.

Verse 17. In the time of cold, in the night, before the rising of the sun, the locust lies in an apparently torpid state, but when warmed by the heat, spreads its wings and disappears. So with those on whom thou hast placed thy dependence. In the time of thine utmost need they will fail thee. מִנְזָרֶיךָ princes, Dag. euphon. טִפְסַר, *satrap*, a general, leader among the Assyrians and Medes, perhaps an Assyrian or Median word, and to be explained from the languages cognate with the Sanscrit. Ges. compares with the modern Persian, *prince* or *war-chief*. גּוֹבַי, the י belongs to the stem, § 86. 1. b.

Verse 18. The utter impotence of the Assyrian leaders is pointed out.

Verse 19. Conclusion. *Actum est de te.* By all which precedes, the way is prepared for the exulting cry. "Deadly is thy wound," which the prophet utters, in unison with all others. שִׁמְעֲךָ, Gen. of object, 'the report of thee.' Who has not cause, on account of the calamities inflicted by thee, to rejoice in thy downfall?

ARTICLE XI.

EARLY HISTORY OF THE ORDER OF JESUITS IN FRANCE.

[The following is a very condensed summary of the contents of the second chapter of Dr. Hermann Reuchlin's Geschichte von Port-Royal, or Der Kampf des Reformiten u. des Jesuitischen Katholicismus unter Louis XIII. u. XIV. Hamburgh, 1844,—an historical work of great and standard value.]

At the time of the formation of the order of Jesuits, there was much in the condition of France to prompt them to make an early and strenuous effort to gain a sure footing in that kingdom. The Reformation was beginning there to raise its head boldly, and to manifest a spirit more hostile to whatever was akin to Catholicism than even in Germany or England. The Catholic State church too, was partially estranged from the communion of the true church. The Sorbonne,

[1] See Credner and Maurer on Joel 1: 4, and Ges. Thesaurus, p. 597.

which for centuries had been the oracle of Christendom in the expression of theological doctrine, seemed on the threshold of treason. Everything was at stake, but also perhaps everything was to be gained, and the renown of the order and its merit in behalf of church and pope in case of success would be only so much the greater.

Already as early as 1540, the year in which Paul III. affixed the papal seal to the bull "Regimini," which has been called the Magna Charta of the Order of Jesus, Ignatius is said to have sent a few of his disciples into France. They did not meet with a favorable reception; they were soon driven from Paris, where they had been obliged to live too much according to the original principle of the Order, by begging; and Francis I. commanded all the subjects of Charles V. to quit the kingdom. But as in the first times of Christianity, persecution served to spread further the doctrines of the gospel, like the tempest which scatters the seeds of a broken plant, so was this expulsion of these poor disciples of Loyola from Paris the first occasion for the settlement of the society at Louvain, where was first enkindled their contest with the Jansenists.

The Jesuits observed in different countries a different course of conduct, according to the national character and circumstances, and their own relation to the people. In the Spanish Provinces, they ventured to draw public attention to themselves by the most impressive means. In Palermo they represented, by a public procession, the power of death over all creatures. In the van of the procession was a large image of the Saviour in a coffin, with an escort of angels and men bearing the instruments of his tortures. Then followed lean and slender forms of knights upon pale horses, and then Death himself upon a black chariot drawn by black oxen, with Time as a driver. Death was a huge skeleton as high as the houses, a sickle of proportionate size in his hands with bow and arrows, and at his feet shovels and mattocks. Behind him, in fetters, was a long train of spectres, representing the different ranks of human life. Exhibitions of this kind, affecting the senses and feelings of great masses like visitants from another world, formed one source of the strength of the Jesuits in Spain, Italy, and Southern Germany; but not with such a retinue did they dare appear in France.

It was in the year 1545 that again some Jesuits, thirteen in number, entered Paris and took up their residence in the college of the Lombards, which had been founded in 1333 for the benefit of poor students from Italy. Here they remained for some time unnoticed. The first who rendered them any assistance and openly recommended them was William du Prat, then bishop of Clermont in Auvergne.

A more powerful protector was found for them in Rome, the cardinal of Lorraine, brother of the well known duke of Guise, and both of them, next to Philip of Spain, the greatest champions of Catholicism. This cardinal induced the king, Henry II, in Jan. 1550, to issue letters patent by which the papal bulls given to the Jesuits were confirmed, and it was permitted them by means of alms and presents, to purchase a house in Paris, in which they might live according to their own rules. But when the Jesuits petitioned parliament to acknowledge and confirm this permission, the attorney general Bruslart, who was called by the parliamentary party the Cato of his age, was disinclined to do it, and their petition was returned ungranted. What especially moved parliament to this step against the Jesuits was the unconditional dependence of the society upon the pope, by reason of which, it was thought, the rights of the Gallican church would be endangered. Moreover, it was said, that the Jesuits in their origin had the purpose to preach the gospel in Turkey and in Morea, and parliament did not wish to put anything in the way of their manifesting their zeal in this manner for the Catholic faith. Even the prelates of the Gallican church expressed the same view; the Jesuits, they said, should seek such places as Rhodes and Crete, which were most favorable to their purpose.

The right of parliament to register and thereby confirm whatever should have the force of law, was not altogether undisputed. Often the kings constrained the registry by their personal appearance, since it was maintained, that the king could not be contradicted in his presence. The Jesuits still hoped to carry their cause successfully against the parliament through the personal influence of some members of the court, and the parliament to maintain their position requested the opinion of the university and of the bishop (not then archbishop) of Paris, not doubting but that from both it would be in their favor. Eustace du Ballay, bishop of Paris, gave his sentence in the year 1554. Acknowledging the reverence and obedience which he owed to the pope and to the king, he yet maintained that the bulls granted to the Jesuits contained several points which could not be tolerated in the Christian church. Among these, he reckons as one, that they appropriate to themselves exclusively the name of disciples of Jesus as if they alone were Christians; next, that since the society would support itself by begging, they made it more difficult for the other mendicant orders, especially in such ungodly times, to get their bread. But a still greater cause of offence is, that the Jesuits, even as pastors, could be disciplined only by their own order, whereby the authority of the bishop in whose diocese they might happen to be, would be set at nought,

and much disorder introduced. Lastly, the Jesuits had reversed the motto *ora et labora;* and while other religious orders spent a large part of the day and of the night even in prayer, they regarded preaching, confession, instruction of youth, and the diligent visiting of families, as more effectual means to ward off heresy and to bring high and low under obedience to the pope.

In December of the same year, the theological faculty of the university gave their sentence. It consists, for the most part, of a repetition of the objections brought forward by the bishop; but the chief motive of their opposition is plainly seen to be their apprehension that the Jesuits would have too much control over the education of youth, the management of which hitherto had been directed entirely by the university.

The Jesuits kept themselves quiet for several years, believing that something would be gained for them by the lapse of time; for the novelty of the order was still a great objection to it. In the year 1559 they made a second attempt to gain a legal acknowledgment of their society in France. This time they were much indebted to the house of Guise. The queen wrote a letter to parliament in their behalf. It was declared that the Gallican privileges should remain inviolable, only let the society be recognized as a religious order. The bishop of Paris gave his consent provided that the bishops should have the right of visitation over them. But parliament deferred action upon the petition, yet without directly contradicting the queen-mother, who held in her hands the government of the State during the minority of Charles IX.

In September, 1561, the queen announced an assembly of the clergy to be held in Poissy, in order to effect some reform in the Catholic church and to terminate those disputes which had arisen with respect to matters of faith. The pope regarded this council with anxious thoughts, not merely because he had a natural disinclination to national councils, but because there was a possibility that it might seem good to the council to secure the tranquility of the kingdom by concessions to the Protestants; for the Guises and the leaders of the Calvinists both felt that in case of open war neither party was secure of victory; and still more did the queen desire a peaceable agreement between the two parties, since in unloosing such hostile elements her own power would be in danger, or, at the best, would be only of secondary authority in the contest of principles. For the Jesuits, however, all hope was lost, if the princes of the Catholic church should make an agreement with the reformed ministers. The personal favor which they enjoyed at court would be insufficient to withstand the hostility of

the university and of parliament. Therefore Lainez, the general of the order and immediate successor of Loyola, accompanied the papal legate to the council. The president, cardinal de Tournon, received him with much favor, and the Order of Jesus was acknowledged by the council, under the condition, however, that they should renounce their name and whatever privileges were incompatible with the rights of the Gallican church. With these limitations, the parliament consented to the decree. The only name which the act of parliament gives to the society is that of *College of Clermont.* The bishop of Clermont, William du Prat, had made a large bequest of property to the society. The validity of the will was disputed in parliament, and it was proposed to divide the property among the other mendicant orders; but in the mean time the Jesuits took advantage of it to purchase the Hotel de Langres, and in honor of the testator called it College of Clermont. This college is situated in the Rue St. Jacques, in the Latin quarter, on the left bank of the Seine, not far from the Sorbonne. This neighborhood must necessarily make their disputes more bitter and personal. Now the Jesuits had a college, but no scholars. These, however, would not have been wanting, had not the Sorbonne immovably refused to have any fellowship with the institution. But what could not be obtained from the entire corporation, was won by craftiness from the rector St. Germain. Those disciples of the Jesuits who received the degree of bachelor, or licentiate, or doctor, should pay the fees for the same to the university. Large numbers of youth entered the schools of the Jesuits, and the influence of the university upon the system of education in the kingdom was at hazard. In 1565, Jean Prevot, who had succeeded St. Germain as rector, forbade the fellows of the College of Clermont to give instruction. They requested to be allowed to become members of the university under the condition that never should one of their number be chosen rector or chancellor. Prevot summoned them to appear before the deputies of the university to answer some questions which he would put to them. The rector, thinking to catch them in a snare, opened the examination with the question whether they were regular or secular clergy. If they replied that they were secular clergy, then their living together was contrary to law; if they were regular clergy, they had no right to give instruction. They replied we are *tales quales*, an expression which afterwards became proverbial. This answer was very shrewd on the part of the Jesuits. The university could draw nothing from it to their injury, for the meaning was clear, We are the society of the College of Clermont, as the council of Poissy has named and confirmed us. To appease the university with regard to this la-

conic reply, in which there was felt to be the sting of contempt, they explained themselves by saying that they were neither common laymen nor secular clergy, but that their humility prevented them from confessing that they were monks, for monks, said they, lead the purest and most perfect life.

When the Jesuits saw that it was vain for them any longer to attempt to gain for their disciples the privileges of the university, they appealed to parliament. But after a stormy debate, everything remained as at first. The Jesuits were not received into the university, but since they had opened schools, they were allowed to continue them. For this decision they were indebted not so much to the good will of parliament as to the influence of the court. The university sought to keep to herself the monopoly of instruction by the regulation that no disciple of the Jesuits should receive the degree of Master of Arts, or Licentiate or Doctor. The Jesuits, in order to elevate their school, invited to Paris one of the greatest scholars who ever adorned their society. This was John Maldonat, born in Estremadura, 1534. The attendence upon his lectures was so great that he was sometimes obliged to deliver them in the public squares. Students went to the lecture-room three hours before the appointed time, to secure a place for taking notes. It is also said that many Protestants attended his lectures. Against this man the theological faculty of the university now directed the force of their opposition. They accused him of heresy, because he thought it not necessary to maintain the doctrine of the immaculate conception of Mary. The Sorbonne upheld this doctrine as an indisputable dogma. But the Jesuit had on his side the authority of the Dominicans and negatively of the Council of Trent which had not deemed it advisable to give a definite decision upon it. The Sorbonne, in deciding as they did upon this doctrine, awakened the jealousy of the French clergy, who were displeased at the claims it put forth to be a judge of matters of faith. The pope directed the bishop of Paris to bring the contending parties to reconciliation. The bishop had become offended with the Sorbonne, because it had censured a translation of the Bible which he had approved and recommended, made by Benoit, pastor of St. Eustace. The strife was so warm that the bishop excommunicated the rector, and the Jesuits had now the pleasure of representing themselves as the defenders of episcopal authority. The noise of these contentions was soon drowned by the outbreaking storm of civil war. The two Guises, the leaders of the Catholic party, had long been the defenders of the Jesuits, and these, therefore, were welcomed to their allegiance as a strong reinforcement for the defence of the

church against the Protestants. France became one vast field of slaughter. The two Guises were assassinated by the contrivance of the king. Soon the dagger of the avenger pierced his own heart. Henry, of Navarre, became thereby the legitimate successor to the throne. The pope declared France free from the duty of obedience to her king. Finally, on the twenty-second of March, 1594, Henry entered Paris, whose population were eagerly desiring to see their king. The Sorbonne and other corporations gave in their submission. The parliament were firm in their allegiance. The Jesuits, however, and also the Capuchins, refused to acknowledge Henry as king, because, notwithstanding his renunciation of the reformed faith, the papal anathema still rested upon him. The university now hoped to strike a decisive blow against the hated order. Most of the clergy of Paris had declared their loyalty, and they united with the university in bringing an accusation against the Jesuits before parliament. The clergy were represented by Louis Dole, the university by Anton Arnauld. The oration of Arnauld had great celebrity in that age. It was translated into most European languages. Fifty years afterwards, during the Jansenist controversy, it was called the hereditary sin of the Arnauld family and the Jesuits did not forget to take vengeance for it. "All France," says Arnauld, "is like the battle-field of Pharsalia, her children are madly destroying each other. They who have kindled this fire of blind and raging passion, are the Jesuits. Had it not been for them, the treasures of the Escurial would now have been in the hands of the victorious French. They have mingled and given to the people the intoxicating drink of rebellion, they have fed the people with bread fermented with Spanish leaven. Their purpose is to bring the kingdom in subjection to the sceptre of Spain. Their chief vow is to render in all things unconditional obedience to the general of their order. But this general is always a Spaniard chosen by the king of Spain. Loyola was a Spaniard, Lainez a Spaniard, Everardus a Flemming, a subject of Spain. Borgia, the fourth general, was a Spaniard. Aquaviva, the present general, is a Neapolitan, a subject of Spain.—O Henry (III.) my great king, who now lookest down from heaven and rejoicest that thy rightful heir in triumph over the bodies of his enemies and surrounded by those who burn to avenge thy death, has thundered down the walls of the last rebellious cities, stand by me and give me fire and strength to enkindle in every French bosom the hatred and the indignation which are due to the authors of thy death and of the unhappiness of thy kingdom. Our country still hovers over the abyss, the authors of our calamities still live among us. It is treason to talk

yet of toleration and of mildness. But, it is said, the Jesuits are teachers of youth. What, I ask, what do they teach the youth? They teach them to wish the death of our kings, and instead of this occupation being in their favor, it increases their crimes in boundless measure, as those scholars who have rejected their doctrines and arts of persuasion, hate them a thousand-fold more than those people do, who never knew the Jesuits. But for one who withstands them, there are a hundred who are corrupted. We read in Dion that Maecenas said to Augustus, that there was no more effectual means for securing the peace of his reign than this, that he commit the instruction of the Roman youth to those whom he knew to be devoted to the monarchy. So for us there is nothing more dangerous than that our youth should be instructed by Spanish spies, who hate above all things else the greatness of the French monarchy. Nothing is easier than to infuse into these yet tender spirits a favorite inclination; nothing more difficult than to take it away from them. It was not the water of Eurotas which made the men of Sparta war-like, but the discipline of Lycurgus, so it is not the Seine nor the Savonne, which has made so many bad Frenchmen, but the schools of the Jesuits. Since the pupils of these schools have come into office, majorum mores non paulatim ut antea, sed torrentis modo precipitati sunt." Arnauld proceeds to set before parliament the sad condition of the university, which is like to a river, whose waters have been drawn off by many canals so that it has become entirely shoal. The judges are called upon by their Alma Mater to fulfil the duties of piety and rescue her from her foes. Charlemagne founded the university as a refuge for science when persecuted by the barbarians. The day of the expulsion of the Jesuits would be the day of a new foundation for the university. Finally, he addresses the king (Henry IV.) whose dear life is continually threatened by these colonies of assassins. "Fearest thou not for thyself, so fear for thy servants." But, notwithstanding this "Philippic," the Jesuits escaped for a season the threatened sentence of expulsion. The king wished to secure their good will rather than further to provoke their resentment. But he was nigh becoming a victim of their fanaticism. He was giving a reception at the house of Madame de Liancour, when, as he bowed to some gentlemen kneeling before him, he suddenly felt the thrust of a knife, which pierced his upper lip and knocked out a tooth. A young man was seen running to the door and was immediately caught. When the king heard that he belonged to the school of the Jesuits, he said, So then the Jesuits must be condemned by my own mouth. The report ran quickly through the city. Naturally

the wound of the king was represented to be more than it really was. The college of the Jesuits was forthwith occupied by soldiers, and their persons and papers secured. Two days after this attempt of Chatel, the expulsion of the Jesuits from the city and kingdom was declared by parliament. The teachers and scholars of the College of Clermont were commanded within three days to remove from Paris and other towns in which they had schools, and within fifteen days to leave the kingdom. The Sorbonne could scarcely rejoice at the fall of their enemies, for six hundred students who were on their way to the university turned back again on this intelligence. About the same number went away. On Sunday, the 8th of January, 1595, the Jesuits were led by officers of justice out of the city. There were thirty-seven of them. Their guilt, as a society, in the attempt made by Chatel to murder the king, is very much to be questioned. The terrors of a frantic, we might say, satanic remorse incited him to the purpose. His past life had been one of flagrant transgressions, and he thought to expiate his sins by causing the death of one so high in rank and power who was under the ban of the pope. No confession could be drawn from him to the prejudice of the Jesuits, although one of the police-agents, disguised as a priest, and a master of his art, examined him amid the solemnities of the holy communion.

The expulsion of the Jesuits had not the desired effects. The jurisdiction of the Parisian parliament embraced but one half of the kingdom, particularly the north-eastern part and the country on the Loire. The parliament of Languedoc, which held its sessions in Toulouse and was constantly implacable towards the reformed churches, favored the Jesuits and declared that they were included in the general amnesty given at the close of the civil war. The parliament of Bordeaux did the same. Such a condition of things could not long continue. These half measures against the Jesuits only stimulated their activity, and in spite of the decree of parliament to the contrary, many children were sent from Paris to be educated by them in the provinces. In the meantime, the Jesuits had friends in Paris, who were intimate with the king. These employed every opportunity, and especially the occasion of his marriage with Mary de Medici, to induce him to give the Jesuits liberty to return. In answer to the reproach that the Jesuits were devoted to the interests of Spain, they replied, that this only showed their gratitude, it depended upon the king of France alone, whether he should be an object of their gratitude or of their hostility. The king still hesitated, though desirous of a reconciliation. He feared that the Protestants would regard it as an act of hostility to them. Accordingly

he wrote to Beaumont, his ambassador in England (August 15th, 1603), to instruct him in what manner he wished his decision to be represented to the monarch of that country. He did not conceal his fear of the dagger, he said that the existing regulations were powerless, and that he could control the Jesuits better as friends than as enemies. In September he gave permission to the Jesuits to establish schools within the districts of Dijon, Toulouse and Bordeaux, also at Lyons and la Fleche. No new settlement could be made without express permission of the government, and an ambassador of the Jesuits, as if of another sovereignty, was to reside at the French court, through whom communications were to be made between the government and the society.

Parliament remonstrated against these proceedings of the king, but perhaps nothing more clearly shows the want of power in the French parliament at this time to withstand the royal will than the result of this remonstrance. The king gave notice that he would not receive their counter-representations, and that their deputies might perhaps be ignominiously refused admittance to his presence. Parliament declared that they would not give their assent without some conditions. These were, that the Jesuits should give up their vow of special allegiance to the pope—that only native Frenchman should be received into the society (which would have made it entirely Gallican), that they should be subject to the jurisdiction of the bishops, and that their schools should be under the control of the university. But the king, by new messages, announcing to parliament that they were his subjects and their first duty was obedience, and by threats of his personal displeasure in case of disobedience, commanded the registry of the act, to which parliament was obliged immediately to proceed. The Jesuits became the friends of Henry and the sure supporters of absolutism in France. Within six years after this time the number of their colleges in the kingdom was thirty-five.

Thus we see that even before the time of Louis XIV. the French parliament had lost its ancient venerable importance, and was presenting a striking contrast to the progress of the English parliament. The Parisian parliament was closely united with the Gallican church, but this church had lost its Christian faith. The more religious elements sought to form a quieter and more retired circle of action. They became embodied in the institution at Port Royal. The doctrine of predestination was common to the reformed church and to the Jansenists, the Puritans of France, but to the former it was a sword, to the latter a shield, to the former it gave courage to conquer, to the latter patience under persecution and endurance even in oppression.

ARTICLE XII.

REMARKS ON INSCRIPTIONS.

New Haven, June 20, 1848.

Prof. Edwards, Dear Sir,—My attention was turned yesterday to the inscriptions copied by Mr. Thomson at Ruad. [See Bib. Sac. p. 252, May 1848.] I send you two or three remarks upon them which may not be entirely without interest.

Inscription on the first column. In line first supply another *Α* after the eighth letter. In line 3 read *π* for *Ω* the first letter. This line may be read thus: *πρόβουλον τῶν ναυπ . . . η. ναυπηγησάντων* suggests itself but is not satisfactory. I can do nothing with the next line.

Inscription on the second column. In line 3 read *Δ* for *Λ*, the first letter. The fourth line is *ἔπαρχον στόλου*. The fifth is *εὐνοίας ἕνεκεν*.

This inscription commemorates the services of Decimus Laelius, praefect of the fleet in Pompey's service. He was the son of another Decimus Laelius, and probably of that one who is spoken of by Cicero, de Or. 2. 6. 25. For our Laelius consult Orelli's Onomasticon Tullianum, and the Dict. of Mythol. and Biog. s. v.

It would be idle to spend time upon the third inscription. That on the fourth column is free from material errors in copying. Probably *τιμῆς* in line 5 should be written *τειμῆς* after the usual practice on the later monuments. See Sophocles' Hist. of the Greek Alphabet, § 29. Damis and Mnaseas are both not uncommon Greek names. Damis performed his duty, as clerk of the market or aedile, in the year 377, which, if the era is that of the Seleucidae, answers to A. D. 65.

The inscription on the fifth column may be easily restored thus: *Ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος Αντίοχον Δημοκρίτου τοῦ καὶ Μαρίωνος, καλῶς γραμματευσαντα ἐν τῷ ΣΟ ἔτει, τειμῆς χάριν*. Democritus was also called Marion. This rare name belonged also to a victor at the Olympic games who lived after Olymp. 178. (Pausan. 5. 21. 5.).

The inscription on the first square block is so imperfect that I will not venture to restore it.

The last inscription may be read thus: *Ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος Ἀραδίων Μάρκον Σεπτίμιον, Μάρκου υἱὸν, Φαβιανὸν Μάγνον, ἑκατοντάρχην λεγεῶνος Σεκούνδης(?) τὸν ἑαυτῶν πολίτην, εὐνοίας καὶ τειμῆς ἕνεκεν*. The name of the legion is wholly uncertain to me. *Δεκιανῆς*, named after the em-

peror Decius, suggests itself, but no legion bears that name on catalogues to which I have access. *Δεκ. Γεμίνης*, i. e. Decimae Geminae, departs further from the present letters. The Latin names of the legions are sometimes preserved on Greek inscriptions. Thus, *Γεμίνη* instead of *Διδύμη*.

The inscription published in your February number, page 3, appears in Boeckh's Corpus, No. 4525.

That on page 6, is interesting, and can be easily restored, except in the fourth line from the bottom. *Ἀσώπιος* (exempli gratia) | *ἀνθύπ.* (i. e. *ἀνθύπατος*, proconsul) *Ὀδαινάθῳ* | *ἀνεινήτῳ* (like *τειμῆς* above) *σεβαστῷ* | *καὶ Σεπτιμίᾳ Ζηνοβίᾳ* | *σεβαστῇ*, . ? . ? ? . | *τοῦ ἀηττήτου τοῦ ? αὐτο* | *κράτορος Οὐαβαλλάθου* | *Ἀθηνοδώρου*. The name of Odaenathus the husband of Zenobia is uncertain. Krafft's copy of this inscription, which Dr. Robinson has been so kind as to send me, has *ΑΙ* instead of *CΔΙ*. Both copies misrepresent the name Septimia, which we know to belong to Zenobia from coins. In the fourth line from the bottom, Krafft gives *ΟΗΤΡΙΤΟΤ* which suggests *μητρὶ τοῦ*. But the *του* of the next line opposes this reading. Both copies also have *Η* at the end of the next line. For Vabalathus Athenodorus, the son (probably) of Zenobia, in whose name she ruled, see Eckhel doctr. num. Vol. 7. p. 488 seq. and Mionnet de la rareté des medailles Rom. 2. 109.

The inscription on p. 13 is so badly copied that I can make nothing of it.

Yours sincerely,

T. D. Woolsey.

The following inscriptions have been recently transmitted to us by Mr. Thomson. "The first was copied from a large stone which appears to have formed part of a pedestal of a statue—found in one of the gardens of Beirût."

IEONIIC . . . . . Broken off . . . . . .
PRAETORIOΛDQVEC . . ᴵᵛVARIOCONSVLI
PROVOCΛNTIBVSEIVSMERITISQVAEPER
SINCVLOSHONORVMCRADOSΛDHOS
EVMDICNITΛTVMΛPICESPROVEXERVNT
DECRETISPROVINCIAEPHOENICESSENTEN
TIADIVINAEIRMATISDDNNCONSTAMET
CONSTATISAETERNORVMPRINCI
RVMORDOBERYTIORVMSTAIVAM
SVMPTIBVSSVISEXΛERELOCATAM
CIVILIHΛB . . ITDDEDICAVIT

"The following is copied from the side of a sarcophagus recently dug up in the gardens of Beirût. The sarcophagus is splendidly ornamented with wreaths, human figures and flying genii."

ΘΑΡCΕΙΤΕΘΝΗ
ΚCΤΑΡΑΠΕΝΘΗ
ΤΟΙCΕΠΙΤΕΚΝΟΙC
ΖωΟΥCΑΝΠΡΟΛΙ
ΠωΝΗΝΕΠΟΘΕΙC
ΑΛΘχΟΝ

"The following was copied from a similar sarcophagus at Jebail. It was recently dug out and had never been opened. The bones of its original occupant were undisturbed—and I have myself examined the gold bracelets and jewelry of the body, found among the bones. The face had been covered with a thick gold leaf, which still preserves the shape of the entire face—a curiosity in its way which I have no where else seen."

ΚΑCCΙΑΑΥCΙΑC
ΦΙΑCΞΕΝΟΥΘΥΙΑ
ΤΗΡΗΚΑΙΚΛΑΥΔΙΑ
ΖΗCΑCΑΕΤ . Μ . . Θ (?)
CωΦωΝΚΑΦΙΛΑΛΙΟC

"The following is the inscription over the Bab et-Dirkeh of Beirût."

ΙΗCΤΟΥΠΡΟCΙΟΝΥΟCλΝΑΡΘΕCΝ—ΝΟΙλΟλ
CΑΦΗCΕΑΕΓΧΟΕΗΠΡΟCΟΨΙΕΙΝΕΤΑΙ
ΙλΙΔΟΥΗΡΟΘΥΜΦCΟΝ . ΡΕΧΕΙCΗΜΗΔΙΡΟΥ
ΗΑΡλΓΑΡΤΟΜΕΙΚΡΟΝΓΕΙΝΕΤλΙΠΑΗΕΧλΡΙC

The following remarks on the above inscriptions have been kindly forwarded to us by Pres. Woolsey.

"In the first line of the first inscription it is easy to conjecture that the name of the individual began with an L, the horizontal part of which is obliterated by time. This being assumed, we hit at once upon Leontio for the entire name; and this emendation derives so much support from other considerations that we may regard it as nearly certain. At the end of the first line stood of necessity *praefecto*. Atque is written adque, as here, in Mss. and on monuments. See Conrad Schneider's Gram. I. 254. The next word was *ordinario*. Comp. Vopiscus in vit. Aurelian. (§ 13, Hist. Aug. Script., ed. Schrevel.): "quum consedisset Valerianus Augustus in Thermis apud Byzantium, praesente exercitu, praesente etiam officio palatino, assidentibus Memmio Fusco consule ordinario, Bebio Macro praefecto praetorii, Quinto Ancario praeside orientis," etc. The consul ordinarius seems to have been so termed by way of distinction from a consul suffectus, as one who began his office on the kalends of January and whose name was inscribed on the fasti of the year. Suetonius, in his life of the emperor Galba (§ 6), says "mox consulatum per sex men-

ses ordinarium gessit." Hence his name appears as the consul of the year 33 after Christ. And again the same author says of Domitian (in vit. § 2), "in sex consulatibus non nisi unum ordinarium gessit, eumque, cedente et suffragante fratre." In the year 73 occurred this ordinary consulship of Domitian. The others may be found in Baiter's fasti consulares (at the end of Orelli's Cicero) or in similar lists. The same term is found not unfrequently in the Theodosian Code. Thus in law 12 de praetor. et quaest. Lib. VI. Tit. 4, we read "ita ut adsint decem e procerum numero qui ordinarii consules fuerint quique praefecturae gesserint dignitatem," etc. Examples from inscriptions will be presently adduced.

Grados in line 4, and Habito in line 11, if they really belong to the stone, may be classed with senati, versorum, versis, and similar forms of the fourth declension to be found in Priscian (Krehl. 1. 268, Putsch. 711). In the eighth line one may conjecture that CONSTATIS ought to be written CONSTATTIS, the A and N having coalesced, so to speak, like the N and T of the previous line. PRINCIRUM of line 9 is perhaps due to false copying.

A word or two now respecting the purport and date of the inscription. Constantius and Constans were emperors together, after the death of their brother Constantine Junior, for ten years from 340 until 350, when Constans was slain by the cavalry of the usurper Magnentius. In the year 344, Leontius and Sallustius were consuls. The name of a Leontius, who is no doubt the same person with the consul and with the one mentioned in our inscription, appears in the inscriptions of several laws in the Theodosian code, which were given out between 338 and 344. In all of them except one where the name of office has probably fallen out of the text, he is addressed as P. P. or PF. P. i. e. praefect of the praetorium. In one (Lib. IX. Tit. 1, L. 7,) he is called Dometius Leontius. Gothofred several times declares that he was praefect of the praetorium for the East,—I know not on what evidence, unless it be that a law in Lib. VII. Tit. 9, without date, addressed to him, may fairly be supposed to relate to the burdens, to which the eastern provincials were exposed from the presence of the army, during the wars of Constantius with the Persians. Our inscription adds to the probability that the East was the sphere of his official duties. During the year 344 he held both the offices mentioned in the inscription, as appears from Leg. 3, de excusat. artif. Lib. XIII. Tit. 4, (Cod. Theodos. ed. Ritter, 6. 61).

Leontius is said to have been raised by his merit through the several grades of honors "ad hos dignitatum apices." In order to take the full force of this expression and to understand what the rank of Leontius was in the empire, one or two things need to be said concerning the system of honors and offices introduced by Constantine. Having wisely sup-

pressed the praetorian guard, he divested their praefects of all military power; and thenceforth the title was bestowed on the most important civil officers of the empire. There were four of them: Gaul, Britain and Spain were under the praefectus praetorio Galliarum; Italy and Africa were governed by the praefect of Italy; Illyricum, Macedonia and Greece by a third, who took his title from the first mentioned territory; and the fourth besides the East which gave him his title, held command over Thrace and Egypt and was more especially attached to the court. This was looked on as one of the highest honors to which a person not belonging to the imperial house could attain. Ammianus Marcellinus says (XXI. 16.) "cunctae castrenses et ordinariae potestates, ut honorum omnium apicem, priscae reverentiae more, praefectos semper suspexere praetorio."

The officials of the empire were arranged by Constantine into five classes: the Illustres, Spectabiles, Clarissimi, Perfectissimi and Egregii, of which last rank little is said. Among the illustres the first dignitaries were consuls, patricii, praefecti praetorio, and magistri armorum or utriusque militiae or equitum and peditum, i. e. generalissimos of the cavalry or infantry, or of both. Patricius was a mere title of honor without office, attached to the person by imperial favor. Thus the consulate and praefecture were, as our inscription says, the 'apices dignitatum,' the highest offices which a subject could fill. The consulate is named last in the inscription because it stood foremost in dignity, although almost an empty name. In a law of the year 382, we have these words: "diversa culmina dignitatum consulatui cedere evidenti auctoritate decernimus," (Cod. Theod. Lib. VI. Tit. 6. ed. Ritter, 2. 73).

The decree in honor of Leontius emanated from the province of Phoenice or Phoenicia. This province belonged to the diocese or superintendency of the East which was included in the Praefecture of the East. The decree is attributed to the province probably as having been passed by the governor, or *consularis Phoenices* and his assessors. It was obtained, we may suppose, at the request of citizens of Berytus, an important town of the province but not the metropolis; which rank at that time was assigned to Tyre. The expense was defrayed by the Ordo, i. e. Ordo decurionum or curia—the municipal senate of Berytus. Concerning the functions of these bodies, Savigny (Gesch. Röm. Rechts Vol. I. chap. 2) and Gothofred's praef. to Cod. Theod. XII. Tit. 1, may be consulted.

The honor consisted in a statue of bronze clad in a toga to indicate the civil offices which Leontius had filled. When placed on its pedestal, which is the stone containing the present inscription, the statue was dedicated or formally declared to be set up in honor of Leontius by the senate which bore the expense.

We may suppose that Leontius was either a native or a benefactor of Berytus. It may deserve perhaps to be brought into connection with the place where this statue was erected, that several persons of the same name seem to have been professors of law at Berytus, in the fourth and fifth centuries. If the name were a less common one, this would make it probable that they were natives of the place, belonging to a family in which the study of law became hereditary.

I will close by citing several parallel passages from inscriptions.

Line 1. We may restore the text by reading *viro illustri.* Compare Orelli, 1152. Fl. Ricimer V. I. magister utriusque militiae Patricius et Ex cons. ord. (i. e. ex consule ordinario), etc.

Line 2. Consul ordinarius occurs, Orelli, 3159, 3183, 3188, (ex cons. ord.) 3191, 1187, and 1152 (u. s.).

Lines 3—5. Orelli, 3159. Rufius Praetextatus Postumianus, etc. (then his honors are enumerated, then it is added) quos tantos ac tales honores primo aetates suae flore promeruit. 1139.—Materno Cynegio per omnes honorum gradus meritorum contemplatione provecto.

Lines 7—8. For the proposal or consent of the emperor to honor some one, comp. Orelli, 3186.—huic senatus auctore M. Aur. Antonino, etc.—statuam poni habitu civili in foro Divi Trajani pecunia publica censuit. See also 3161 cited below, and 1139, where a statue is erected according to a decree of Theodosius and Arcadius. In this latter inscription DD. NN. is written out Domini Nostri. Constanti on the marble is written probably with the final letter I longer than the others to show its equivalence to ii. This is often the case. Comp. C. Schneider, 2. 60. For aeternorum principum, Comp. 3161.—sacro judicio aeterni principes —erigi collocarique jusserunt.

Line 9. Comp. 3165, ordo splendidissimus Beneventanae civitatis, and other inscriptions.

Line 10. Locatam. 3192. $\overline{\text{DD}}$. $\overline{\text{NN}}$. Valentinianus et Valens—statuam sub auro constitui locarique jusserunt.

Line 11. Civili habitu occurs 3186 and 1139.

The second inscription from a sarcophagus recently dug up at Beirût contains an elegiac distich of which the hexameter halts in the third foot.

> Θάρει, (τεθνηκότ' ἄρα πένθη,) τοῖς ἐπὶ τέκνοις
> Ζώουσαν προλιπὼν ἦν ἐποθεις ἄλοχον.

I understand this inscription thus: His wife was ill and he was expecting to lose her. She recovered, however, and he died leaving her to take care of the children. "Take courage (dead then as it would seem are your sorrows) seeing you have left behind to take care of the children your wife whom you were just ready to mourn for." The parenthesis is

awkward and the text suspicious. Mr. Sophocles of Harvard thinks that the poet wrote: *Θάρσει· τέθνηκας γὰρ πενθητοῖς ἐπὶ τέκνοις*, "take courage, for at your decease you left a wife whom you loved in charge of children about whom you felt anxious." Mr. Hadley of Yale College suggests the following slight change in the first line: *Θάρσει· τέθνηκας γὰρ ἀπενθής, τοῖς ἐπὶ τέκνοις*, etc., by which a very good sense is elicited.

The third is plain. "Cassia Lysias daughter of Philoxenus also called Claudia who lived, years — months XI. (?). Sophron and Philadius" (erected this monument). *Σωφων* is evidently wrong, and *Φιλάδιος* must be, it would seem, a proper name, of which I am unable to produce another example.

The fourth and last inscription is very imperfectly copied. A correct copy by Berggren appears in Boeckh's Corpus, Vol. III. fasc. 1, No. 4530, and here follows:

Τῆς τοῦ προσιόντος ἀνδρὸς ἐννοίας ἀεὶ
σαφὴς ἔλεγχος ἡ πρόσοψις γείνεται,
Δίδου προθύμως ὃ παρεχεις, ἢ μὴ δίδου·
παρὰ γὰρ τὸ μεικρὸν γείνεται πλήρης χάρις.

"Sensus est:" says the editor, "viri qui te adeat ut stipem aut beneficium a te postulet facies ipsa animum ejus declarat. Igitur quum dubitationi locus non sit, da ei prompte aut nihil prorsus da; nam tempus breve est, quo plena initur gratia." Versus extremas ita jam Heusinger interpretatus est in schedis. Titulum hunc Maundrellius putat ex ara esse, et pertinere ad coenam Domini, quoniam qui coenam Domini adirent, a veteribus sint dicti *οἱ προσιόντες*. Minus id necessarium, neque causa in aperto. Quamquam videri potest Christianus esse titulus.

In closing I will add an unpublished Latin inscription found by Dr. De Forest at ruins, near the village Bara.

Nectareos succos Baccheïa munera cernis
Quae bitis genuit aprico sole refecta.

Baccheïa is found Virg. Georg. 2. 454. For b instead of v in bitis, comp. Freund's Wörterbuch under the letter B. Genuit with long i, is excused by the arsis. It may be doubted whether *apricus* was ever used by the Latin poets as an epithet of the sun itself.

ARTICLE XIII.

LITERARY AND THEOLOGICAL MISCELLANIES.

Theology and Politics have many points in common. Civil government is a Divine Institution. The authority of the law of the land rests upon the fact that the State is an ordinance of God. One sound political principle therefore is, the divine right of the State, not the divine right of kings, nor the divine right of the aristocracy, nor the divine right of the democracy, but the divine right of the State, whether the authority of the State be expressed through one, through a few, or through the many.

In a time when the forms of government in many countries of the old world are rapidly changing, whatever tends to throw light upon the relation of ruler and people in those countries in which monarchical government still exists, is not without interest or value. We present our readers with a translation of the speech of Frederick William IV. king of Prussia, to the Estates of Prussia, on the 15th of October, 1840, when they were assembled to give their oath of allegiance to him as successor to the throne. It may, perhaps, have an interest both because it illustrates the character of the distinguished person whose sentiments are therein expressed, and because it furnishes a subject of comparison with the spirit of recent events in that country. As the privy-counsellor Mathis was reading the preamble to the oath, his majesty the king arose and addressed the Estates as follows:

"It was formerly the custom that the Estates of Germany did not give their allegiance, until the safeguard for their allegiance had been received. I will in like manner adhere to this custom. I know, indeed, and I avow it, that I have my crown from God alone, and that it comports me well to say, Woe to him who touches it. But I know also, and confess it before you all, that I wear my crown as a fief from the Most High, and that to Him must I give account of every day and of every hour of my government. Whoever desires an assurance for the future, to him I give these words. A better assurance can neither I, nor any man upon earth give. It presses more heavily and binds more firmly than all coronation-oaths, than all promises inscribed upon brass or parchment, for it flows from life, and has its source in faith. Whoever of you, whose desire is not for a so-called glorious government, which resounds to posterity with the clash of arms and the noise of trumpets, but who is contented with a simple, paternal, genuine German government, let him have confidence in me, and with me let him trust in God that He will bless the vows which daily I offer to Him, and make them serviceable and rich in blessing to our beloved father-land."

The impression which these royal words produced upon the hearts of the Estates, was manifested by their enthusiastic cheering; and the recital of the oath, which followed, was like to a rushing stream. The assembly of the Estates was held in the 'White Hall' of the palace, but the chief ceremony of the day took place under the open canopy of heaven. Upon an elevated platform adjoining the palace was the royal throne. In the immediate neighborhood of his majesty were the royal princes and the diplomatic corps. Next were the knights and chief military officers. Further to the right of the throne were the evangelical clergy, and upon the left, the Catholic clergy. Immediately in front of the platform were the deputies from Silesia, Pomerania, Westphalia, and other provinces. The public square, between the palace and Museum, was crowded with citizens. Before the declaration of the oath on the part of the people, his majesty arose, stepped forward to the edge of the platform, and addressed the assembled multitude as follows:

"In this solemn moment, when my German subjects, the noblest branch of the noblest people, present to me their allegiance, mindful of the indescribable hour at Königsberg, which is now repeated, [on the 10th of September the king had received the allegiance of the Northeastern provinces at Königsberg, the ancient capital of the kingdom,] I invoke God the Lord to confirm with his almighty Amen the vows which have already been uttered and which are yet to be uttered. I promise to exercise my government in the fear of God and with love of man, with open eyes, when the necessities of my people require, with closed eyes when justice requires it, and without respect of persons. I will, so far as my power and my will extend, maintain peace in my time, and truly support the efforts of the great powers which, for a quarter of a century, have been the faithful guardians of the peace of Europe. (These words found a joyous response in the exulting shout of the multitude.) Especially will I strive to secure for our father-land that place to which Divine Providence, by an unparalleled history, has elevated it, and by which Prussia has become a shield for the safety and the rights of Germany. In all respects I will so reign, that one shall recognize in me the genuine son of an immortal father, of an immortal mother, whose memory shall be blessed from generation to generation. But the ways of kings are sorrowful and call for tears of commiseration, if the heart and spirit of their people are not ready to accompany them with a helping hand. Therefore, in the enthusiasm of my love to my glorious father-land, to my people born amid arms, in freedom and in obedience, (continued cheering from the people, which did not cease till after repeated beckonings from his majesty,) I put to you, gentlemen, in this earnest hour an earnest question, Can you, in your own name and in the name of those who have sent you, knights, citizens, yeomen, and all the innumerable crowds that hear me, can you answer me, as I trust, so do answer me—I ask you, will you, with heart and spirit, with word and deed, in the holy fidelity of Germans, and in the still holier love of Christians, stand by me and help me to preserve Prussia as she now is and

as she must remain if she perish not? Will you stand by me and help me to unfold still more gloriously those qualities by which Prussia, with her only fourteen millions, is numbered with the great powers of the earth, namely, honor, fidelity, striving after light, right, and truth, and a spirit of progress strengthened by the heroic courage of youth and tempered by the wisdom of age? Will you not desert me in this striving, but faithfully abide with me through evil as through good days? Oh, then, answer me upon your honor, with the clearest and most beautiful sound of our mother-tongue, *Ja!* (In the expression of this *Ja*, uttered by many thousand tongues, one could clearly perceive the decisiveness and earnestness with which the question was put to the people.) The solemnities of this day are important for the State and the world. Your *Ja*, however, was for me; that is my own; I give it not up; it binds us indissolubly in mutual love and faithfulness; it gives courage, strength, confidence; and in my dying hour I shall not forget it. The vows I have uttered, with the help of God I will keep. For a witness thereof, I raise my right hand to heaven; and may the bountiful blessing of God rest upon this hour."[1]

Hereupon followed the administration of the oath by the Privy-counsellor Mathis; and, spoken by 20,000 men, it sounded far in the distance as the expression of one heart and of one spirit.

We have received the first two numbers of the "Journal of Sacred Literature," edited by John Kitto, D. D., of London. The principal contributors are Prof. Powell of Oxford, Drs. Alexander and Eadie of Edinburgh, Drs. Cox and Pye Smith of London, Dr. Dobbin of Dublin, Mr. Nicholson, the translator of Ewald's Hebrew Grammar, etc. The subjects, treated in the longer articles, are Free Inquiry in Theology, The Law and the Gospel, German Rationalism, Idiomatic Usages of the Plural in Hebrew, Chrysostom, Moslem Traditionary Customs, etc. There are also a number of translations from the German, short observations on passages of Scripture, correspondence, etc. We have availed ourselves of some items of information which are found in its pages. The work is beautifully printed, and from the talent and learning embarked in the enterprise, it cannot fail to meet with a favorable reception from the British public.

Through the kindness of the publishers, Messrs. Jackson and Walford, St. Paul's Churchyard, we have received a number of the "Biblical Review," which is published quarterly, and is conducted by a number of gentlemen, among whom are Rev. John Harris, D. D., Dr. William Smith, etc. The No. before us is the 22d in the series. The initials only of the names of the writers are given. The titles of the articles are, Sketches of the Doctrine of Angels; Heretics of the Middle Ages, translated from the Studien u. Kritiken; The Sovereignty of God; The

[1] "Translated from "Königsworte gesprochen vom Throne bei der preussischen Huldigungsfeier," published at Schwedt, 1840.

Posthumous Works of Dr. Chalmers; Tholuck's Introduction to the Psalms, much abridged; the Logic of Theological Inquiry; Nonconformist Poetry; the Pulpit and the People, and notices of fifty new books. The work is of a more miscellaneous character than the 'Journal of Sacred Literature,' and is supported mainly, we believe, if not wholly, by the Congregationalists. It appears to be well worthy of their patronage. The two periodicals give conclusive evidence that a decided taste for biblical studies is extending among our transatlantic brethren.

The first Vol. of Dr. Davidson's Introduction to the New Testament is in the press. It will make an ordinary sized octavo, and will embrace the four Gospels. The author is understood to have entered fully into all questions of moment, and has examined the most recent German literature in relation to it, including the productions of the Tübingen School, Baur, Schwegler, Zeller, etc. Particular attention has been given to John's Gospel, as it has been more attacked and canvassed than the others.

We are requested to state that a lady in Liverpool is in possession of a Hebrew MS. of the Pentateuch, which she is desirous to sell. It is written in large, clear letters, without points, in a most beautiful hand, and is in excellent preservation. The length is about 52 yards and the breadth a little over two feet. The age is not great, though it cannot be certainly determined. It was bought of a Jew in Hamburgh. Further particulars can be ascertained of the Rev. Dr. Davidson of Manchester.

We regret to learn that the labors of Rev. Dr. E. Henderson, in his Commentary on Jeremiah, have been interrupted by ill health.—The Hebrew Lexicon of Prof. Jarrett of Cambridge seems to be intended for beginners rather than for advanced students. It includes a Hebrew Grammar, a Chaldee Grammar, and a Grammatical Analysis of Genesis. —Rev. Patrick Fairbairn of Salton, Scotland, is translating from the German Henry's life of John Calvin.—Rev. Dr. John Brown of Edinburgh has published in three octavo volumes, "The First Epistle General of Peter, illustrated in Expository Discourses."—The four volumes of Clark's Foreign Theological Library, for the year 1848, are the 2d vol. of Davidson's Translation of Gieseler's Ecclesiastical History, the 2d and 3d vols. of Olshausen's Commentary on the Gospels, and the 3d vol. (completing the work) of Hengstenberg on the Psalms.—Torrey's Translation of Neander's General Church History has been reprinted at Edinburgh, in 1 vol. pp. 1028.—Among the recent publications in Great Britain are: Statements and Reflections respecting the Church and Universities, by Abp. Whateley; the 3d volume of Fletcher's History of the Revival and Progress of Independency in England; a new volume of Wilson's Continuation of Mill's British India, and the Select Works of Ephrem the Syrian, translated from the Syriac by J. B. Morris.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

AND

THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

NO. XX.

NOVEMBER, 1848.

ARTICLE I.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC RELIGION IN ITALY.

By B. B. Edwards, Professor at Andover.

Over the door of the Basilica of St. John Lateran in Rome are the words: Sacro sancta Lateranensis Ecclesia, omnium urbis et orbis Ecclesiarum Mater et Caput. This is no idle boast. The realm over which Augustus Caesar swayed his sceptre was narrow compared with that of his spiritual successor. The encyclical letter which emanates from the Quirinal Palace is addressed to one half the civilized world, and binds the consciences of a fourth of the human race. What is the complexion of this religion at home? What are its features when seen on its native soil? Does the heart of the great system beat with energy, or does it give signs of decay and dissolution? We are naturally interested in visiting the spring of a mighty river, in examining the elements of an influence that has shaped the destiny of the world through one third of its duration.

When viewed historically the subject is one of extraordinary interest. It is often said that men are never aroused in the highest degree, except on religious grounds; that to accomplish a great and difficult political object, the conscience must be invoked; motives that reach beyond the grave must be appealed to. In Italy this complexity of motives, this intermingling of human passions with the awful sanctions of religion, this blending of civil and ecclesiastical interests have been witnessed as they have been nowhere else. Political con-

spiracies have been concealed or disclosed on pain of eternal death. The darkest crimes against the State have been committed on the promise of God's forgiveness. The police have found their readiest coadjutors or their bitterest foes at the confessional. Elsewhere the State has trampled on the church. In other countries, the church is the obsequious handmaid of the political power, is chained to the chariot wheel of kings and cabinets. In Rome an aged priest has united all the offices of the Jewish theocracy. Senators and armies, councils and courts, have done the bidding of a superannuated monk.

The extraordinary events which have rapidly followed each other, and which are now occurring, through all Southern and Western Europe, clothe this topic with especial interest. What effect will these political revolutions exert on the established and dominant Religion? Will they essentially weaken its hold on the affections of the people? Will they undermine all prescriptive rights? If ecclesiastical reforms shall follow in the train of those which are municipal or civil, will such reforms endanger the supremacy of the Catholic system? Should all State patronage be withdrawn, has the church a recuperative force so that she could adapt herself to the new order of society? Or if the Catholic system should be utterly subverted, would any desirable form of Protestantism take its place? Would the destruction of that old hierarchy put an end to the spirit of bigotry and persecution? Wherein is a radical and nominal Protestantism better than that ancient church tyranny?

The subject, moreover, vitally concerns us as American scholars and Christians. Papal Europe, even Italy herself, look to this country with eager curiosity and hope. Uncounted multitudes constantly find an asylum here. At the present time, in no national legislature except our own, would the members of the company of Jesus find upholders and apologists. With, in some respects, a feeble, negative, hesitating Protestantism, with paralyzing divisions in our own ranks, in the absence of comprehensive plans, and especially of a gentle and Christian spirit in our religious discussions, there may be imminent danger to our institutions. Exact acquaintance with the spirit of those with whom we have to deal, becomes a necessity which cannot well be exaggerated.

I. Our object, in the first place, will be to point out some of the causes of the growth of the Roman Catholic system in Italy, and of its existence through so many ages. It is customary to think of that hierarchy as founded on error exclusively, on childish superstitions, or on stupendous falsehoods. The judgments often passed upon it

are indignant and summary, rather than discriminating and just—the decisions of a heated zeal, not of patient and dispassionate inquiry. Now it is inconceivable that a system could have existed so long, unless it had some sound and vigorous roots. If it had not possessed ingredients of truth and permanence, it would have been torn up ages ago, utterly prostrated in some of the rude shocks it has encountered. Its inherent vigor is demonstrated by its existence for fifteen hundred years.

The Roman Catholic system is characterized by extraordinary contrasts and heterogeneous elements. In one aspect it is so weak that it seems to be tottering to its fall; in another, its strength is impregnable. Now it should seem that it must yield to the force of irrefragable argument and uncontradicted fact; now the Protestant advocate feels that he himself needs weapons of the keenest temper and an arm of practised ability. No one who has looked into the Romish system will despise it. No one who has encountered the Romish dialectics can fail to be impressed with their unmatched subtlety.

1. The long duration and flourishing state of the Roman Catholic system in Italy have been owing in a degree to the physical features of the country and to the historical associations. Italy is the native region of beauty. The water, the earth, the air, the sun-light seem to have an inherent and peculiar charm. A distinguished German painter, Angelica Kaufmann, said that she could not paint away from Rome; there was an artistic quality in the water. Much of the delightful scenery is admirably fitted to give effect to the gorgeous ceremonial of the Romish church. The volcanic regions of the South, with their constant chemical changes, afford many facilities for a deceptive and imposing superstition.

The papal religion is one that cometh by observation, by pomp and outward circumstance. It needs the open air. In the bleak regions of the North it is robbed of half its impressiveness. Some of the most striking portions of its ritual cannot be displayed within the walls of a church. Its crosses must be consecrated at the road side. Its torches and funeral wailing need the darkness and silence of the night heavens.

The country too is old; it is full of hoary reminiscences, reaching beyond the time of the Romans; the line between fable and history is ill defined. The country is most perfectly fitted to a religion which clings tenaciously to the past, which has an immutable faith, and which, instead of relying on reason, independent judgment, and a thorough private study of the Bible, has appealed to the sentiment, to the fancy and the outward sense. In short it is a religion which has

seized on every advantage furnished by its locality, adroitly turning the laws of nature to its own benefit.

2. The Romish system in Italy relies in a measure on its antiquity. It has existed almost from the apostolic age. The great sects of Protestantism seem but children of yesterday. This church says her masses at altars built or begun before the time of Constantine. It has placed its great symbol in the Flavian amphitheatre, commenced by Vespasian. It has charge of those solemn subterranean chapels, on whose dark walls is carved the palm-branch of the martyrs.[1] Her litanies were chanted by Ambrose and Augustine. On the stones of her Appian Way, as they now lie, apostles and evangelists walked.

This appeal to antiquity derives its support from several sources. It has its foundation in the nature of man, in one of his primary and strongest tendencies. We naturally reverence what is old. We cling to by-gone days. Amid the shifting scenes of the present and the uncertainties of the future, we fondly disentomb the long buried past. The feeling is not confined to one class of men. The illiterate and the learned alike share in it. Respect for the aged is the marked characteristic of the whole oriental world. The removal of ancient landmarks has been guarded by heavy imprecations. An old Bible, the heir loom of several generations, is often the most precious family treasure. Of this vital and universal attribute of man, the Italian church avails herself to the utmost. Mighty empires have disappeared; she remains. The palaces of the Caesars have crumbled long ago; the apostolic faith still lives in its primeval bloom, attracting fresh veneration, greeted with a more passionate love as ages pass away.

Again, she has adroitly strengthened this sentiment, by appealing to the abuse and perversion of the opposite. Innovation is sometimes followed by bitter fruits, often so at first, when the ultimate effect may be beneficial. A popular revolution ends in despotism, freedom of speech in licentiousness, freedom of thinking in heartless infidelity. Reform is only the cloak under which some discontented spirits hide their ambitious designs. Democracy in church and State is only another name for anarchy. Every unsuccessful experiment of this nature, and history is full of them, has been eagerly seized by this conservative church, and turned to the utmost practical account. Not a little of her power is traceable to this source. She has selected with a sagacious eye, and with a far reaching policy, the most disastrous

[1] Both the crown and palm-branch are borrowed from paganism; but they received additional significance to the Christian from the mention of them in the book of Revelation.—*Maitland's Church in the Catacombs*, p. 177.

events in Protestant history, the most melancholy facts in the annals of perverted reason. How much better, she has proudly asked, is the boasted country of Martin Luther, iron-bound by a godless rationalism, than what men call ignorant and superstitious Italy? Which is to be preferred, the order-loving and tolerant cantons in Catholic Switzerland, with a few peaceable, Jesuit schoolmasters, or those democratic, Protestant districts where a portion of the people at this moment cannot celebrate the Lord's supper but at the peril of life?

Another source of this influence is the mellowing effect of time. The evil that men do is buried with them; the good lives and is evermore hallowed. Errors and weaknesses disappear behind the dusky veil of time; good and great actions stand out in the boldest relief. Critically to analyze the character of the men whom we idolize, would be like desecrating the tomb of a father. Hence there prevails an idea of the faultless character of the piety of the primitive church, which has no foundation in reality. Hence the Italian Catholic looks only on the great illuminated points in the history of his church, passing over the vallies covered with darkness, the marshes stagnant, and redolent with all corruption. To his eye, his mother church in her long, bright history seems like the queen of oriental cities, sitting on the shore of the narrow sea in paradisiacal beauty. We listen to some of the Ambrosian chants or the mediaeval hymns, sung in a temple moss-grown through seven hundred years; the words have an indescribable tenderness, an unearthly solemnity as they float among the arches and linger around the marble columns, and wander along the fretted roof. As the *Stabat mater dolorosa* peals from the organ and from voices without number, we seem to hear those wailing tones and catch the very accents of the holy women who came to see that great sight; and we forget the fatal theological error which lurks in those awful sounds or in those words which embody the very soul of music. No other church has such treasures, because every other is comparatively modern.

3. The Italian church has been sustained in part by permanent funds or by a large, fixed capital. We do not refer so much to the religious foundations, monasteries, nunneries and institutions of the like nature, as to the endowments which support the parish churches, and those which are devoted to the direct extension of Papacy. The former stand on a more precarious tenure, and have often been confiscated or swept away in a revolution. But the capital which has maintained the parochial clergy has been, whatever may be the case in the future, one of the firmest supports of the system. In Tuscany, which has about two thirds of the population of the State of New

York, the permanent funds for the maintenance of the regular clergy amount to several millions of dollars. Whatever is not necessary to the support of the priest is scrupulously distributed to the poor.[1] This provision places the clergy in a position independent in a measure of the people, while it does not diminish their influence over their flocks. What an efficient instrument for the extension of the Catholic faith has been the Congregation de Propaganda Fide at Rome—an entire street filled with its imposing edifices? Its presses in number, its types in variety of languages, its pupils gathered literally from the four quarters of the earth, are a most striking practical proof that the ubiquity of the Catholic church is not a mere rhetorical exaggeration. It is sometimes said that nothing but ardent love to Christ and true faith in his word will sustain a foreign missionary for a series of years in a barbarous and pagan country. Yet the pupils of the Propaganda and other adherents of this religion, have exhibited in unnumbered instances and through long centuries, the most unshaken zeal and the most heroic courage. Either they have been animated by the true Christian spirit, or else the general proposition just referred to is not founded in fact. No isolated efforts, no merely voluntary contributions could ever accomplish what that celebrated society have done. The order of Jesuits is not an exception. They have been, as is well known, the founders of the most splendid churches, the authors or promoters of the largest permanent foundations belonging to the Catholic hierarchy, themselves in turn supported by these foundations.

St. Peter's church itself may be regarded as a permanent fund, whose value for the papacy arithmetic can hardly compute. It stands as the noblest representative of the unity of the Catholic faith, in unapproached grandeur by any edifice now standing, or that was ever built by Greek or Roman, and which Michael Angelo said he labored upon for the love of God. This church by its history, by its associations with the earlier edifice which stood on the same spot, by its faultless proportions, by its effects every year on the thousands who behold it, Protestants and Catholics, the guides of taste and public sentiment in their respective countries, becomes a support to the system, which words have no power to delineate, is an investment for

[1] Florence, e. g. is divided into parishes; there is generally in each parish one parish church, besides other churches and chapels, to each church belong benefices more or less, which are in the hands of patrons, rich families and others; these benefices vary in value from fifty to one hundred or two hundred dollars; there is often great competition for them among the young priests, there being more applicants than places. The candidate must possess a living worth fifty dollars before he can make application. The funds of a church are in the hands of the sacristan.

that church immeasurably richer than the marble and the gold which so profusely adorn it.[1]

May it not be a question, whether we have not seriously and unnecessarily weakened the influence of Protestantism by encouraging the tendency which would abandon all aid from permanent endowments, which would teach us to rely exclusively on the spontaneous liberality of the Christian church? May we not thereby have reason to apprehend evils of no inconsiderable magnitude? Have we not, on this subject, anticipated a period which is yet far off, relying on a steady philanthropy, a warm and uniform Christian charity which does not now exist? May we not expose an institution of great importance, or what is of more value, minds of fine accomplishments in the Christian ministry, whose training has been very costly, to the caprice of a fickle and arbitrary majority, or to the persecution of an unrelenting minority, where all independence of mind, all honorable feeling, is sacrificed to the fashions or caprices of an hour, where the only alternative is cowardly compliance with what conscience and reason do not approve, or starvation?

By fostering this prejudice, this ill-considered tendency, we have manifestly put it out of our power to promote certain objects, which urgently need a permanent basis, which cannot from the nature of the case appeal to popular support, and which—such is the hostility that has been excited against every proposition of the kind—cannot receive the aid of those individuals, who might otherwise possess that enlargement of mind which would lead them to become efficient patrons. Because of some minor evils, or of some fancied and groundless fears, we reject that which the wisdom of ages has approved, and which has been essential to build up both the true and the false systems of learning and of faith.

The two ancient universities in England have never been what they ought to have been; neither are they now what they should be. These great endowments have been the sources of evils both to church

[1] The ancient basilica had existed above one thousand years. The first stone of the new edifice was laid in 1506 by Julius II. The plan was traced by Bramante, who conceived the idea of the dome from Brunelleschi's effort at Florence. His successor, under Leo X., was Giulio di San Gallo; then Raphael with five assistants; then Antonio di San Gallo; then Michael Angelo, who erected the greater part of the dome; he was succeeded by several architects, till 1654, nearly two centuries from the time at which the idea of building it was entertained, when the essential parts were completed, at a cost of 47,000,000 of scudi, about £11,000,000. "The gorgeous dome, suspended in mid air is a firmament; the place indeed has an atmosphere of its own, and in this vastest of cathedrals, the temperature knows no change; neither the enervating *scirocco*, nor the piercing *tramontana*, nor winter nor summer, influence the soft air of this mighty temple"—*Cooke's Rome*, p. 40.

and State. Yet no one could have the hardihood to assert that the evils have been preponderant, that these foundations have not been the sources of good, great and inestimable. The warmest friend of spontaneous charity, and of an unceasing appeal to popular sympathy, could not wish to see them demolished, or their princely revenues dissipated.

4. Italian Catholicism has one of its main supports in the Fine Arts.

Three questions here naturally occur. What is the value of these objects of art? What connection have they with the Roman Catholic religion? What will be their probable influence hereafter?

In answer to the first question, it may be said that no value can be placed upon the principal objects. The price is beyond estimation or conjecture. Perhaps no article of property, movable or fixed, can be compared with them in worth. They could not be exchanged for fine gold. Crown jewels, the regalia of kings, the revenue of diamond mines would be no temptation to the owners of these objects. Gold can be purchased; it is a vulgar article of commerce; diamonds can be dug out of the earth; but no Promethean art can reillumine the soul of Raphael, or spread before him those visions of superhuman beauty. The wealth of the Indies could not replace the Apollo, were it destroyed. The Sistine chapel could be painted only by him who hung the dome of St. Peter's.

All the capitals of Italy, and most of the principal cities, contain galleries filled with objects, which become the more precious as time advances. Years of intelligent and patient and genial study cannot exhaust them, can only help one to begin to understand them, any more than the genius of Homer or of Milton can be comprehended in a day or a year. Two or three of these Italian masters stand on the same unapproachable elevation with those great poets that shine with a never setting light. These galleries, these immortal works are not locked up, are not secluded from the vulgar gaze, like the idols of the East, but they are visited and studied by all Christendom, Catholic and Protestant. They are the goal of pilgrims as fervent as ever wound their way to the shrine of a prophet. They are moulding the taste, shaping the sentiments and determining the character of some of the leading minds of the age, of all who have any power to appreciate beauty in its deathless forms.

The second inquiry is, How are these objects of art connected with the Roman Catholic religion? Rather we may ask, Wherein are they not interfused and incorporated, made to breathe an influence which is ever insinuating and all but universal? The religion is ad-

dressed in a preëminent degree, especially in its practical workings, to the imagination, the fancy, the feelings, the outward sense. It seeks to take the reason captive by filling the eye with tears, by enchanting the ear, and by stirring all the sensibilities of our nature. Admiration is the mother of devotion; God, through the medium of the virgin, is influenced by tears and passionate outcries and wailing lamentations. To the building up of this stupendous system, kings, patriarchs, popes, councils, theologians, monks, missionaries have not been the sole, perhaps not the principal contributors. The gods of papal Rome were made by the chisel and the pencil of more cunning workmen than these. Craftsmen more honored in life than any of the Gregories or Leos; since their death canonized with a profounder homage, lent all the charms of their inimitable genius to support and adorn what they could not enough honor. One of them sleeps in the Pantheon, whom, when he was alive, men regarded with religious veneration as if God had revealed himself through him, as he did in former days by the prophets. The tomb of another is in the Westminster Abbey of Florence, by the side of those of Machiavelli, Galileo and Dante.

The position of the holy virgin in the Romish system is well known. It has been often observed that the degree of reverence paid to the sacred persons is in the following order: the virgin, her Divine Son, God the Father. Fourteen festivals in the calendar are dedicated especially to her honor. Churches innumerable bear her name. Altars the most sacred and cherished are fragrant with incense to her coëqual glory. Everywhere and in all possible forms, she is adored. Yet the most worthy offering ever presented to her was the genius of Raphael. She was the ideal of all heavenly beauty forever floating before him, the subject of his dreams by night, his toils by day. Nowhere does his genius revel so as upon her form. Never have all the types, and symbols, and conceptions of beauty been so etherealized as in the touch of his pencil on this entrancing theme. The gems of the richest collections in Europe are Raphael's Madonnas.

The same remarks apply substantially to most of the other masters of painting. The great attraction at Parma is Correggio's picture, the most remarkable figures in which are the Madonna and child, Mary Magdalene and Jerome. "The eminently grand picture" of the academy at Venice is the Assumption of the virgin by Titian. A Madonna, unlike any other, sweet and beautiful exceedingly, is that by And. del Sarto in the Pitti palace at Florence. In the academy at Bologna, the visitor is instantly attracted to the Madonna della Pietà of Guido; and so in many other places. The artists have lav-

ished the resources of the highest genius in making the Roman Catholic religion visible, in embodying it in breathing forms, in commending its most objectionable features, through the fascinations of an inimitable coloring, to all men of accomplished minds. To reject a doctrine presented in this form seems to be a rebellion against the canons of taste, an extinguishing of the lights of learning and civilization. Not to palliate or overlook an anti-scriptural dogma, or a fatal error, when it is surrounded with all the illusions of genius, is a barbarism which multitudes of Protestants would shrink from being guilty of. Those who would on no account kiss a relic or worship the host, will, yielding up their better judgment, bestow their warmest admiration upon the still more objectionable forms of pictured or sculptured beauty. An idolatrous attachment to some of the Christian fathers is one of the sins of the Roman Catholic church. But this is a peccadillo, or in a great measure atoned for, if the artist has added his imperishable sanction. The worship of images has been the reproach of the Papal church for ages; yet, in the view of many Protestants even, it seems a venial offence, as they gaze on the fresco and mosaic, or the marble standing before them, wrought with cunning skill and almost warm with life. It is a total perversion of the design of a church to crowd it with specimens of art or antiquity, to make it, as it often is in Europe, a museum or a picture gallery. It is said that there are nearly fourteen thousand granite columns in Rome, relics of the times of the empire, and more than six thousand antique columns of marble, many of which are in the churches, and thus become to multitudes objects of intenser interest than the worship of God, or the doctrines of Christ.[1]

The remaining question is, What will be the position and influence of the Fine Arts hereafter? How far will the Roman Catholic church rest on them as among its firmest supports?

That they will supply one of the moulding influences of society, even in its best and most Christian state, there can be no doubt. Some of the productions of the great masters, should they be spared in the accidents of time, can never cease to be the teachers of the world, because they are addressed to a primary and imperishable part of our nature, because they furnish correct and most awakening conceptions of truth, and excite the religious feelings in a degree compared with which spoken words have little power. For example, the pictures of the Crucifixion and the Last Judgment by Rubens, and of the Transfiguration by Raphael, are coincident with Scriptural truth, and will haunt the memory and awaken awful fear, or profound adora-

[1] Burton's, Rome II. p. 115.

tion, or tender love, days and weeks after they are withdrawn from the sight. These works are an index of what the human soul is capable of effecting, and their direct tendency is to fill the mind with exalted views of the glory of Him who breathed into man the breath of genius. They present before him who gazes upon them an ideal of excellence in the highest degree exciting and influential, whatever be the nature of his pursuits. In possessing susceptibilities that can derive satisfaction from such sources, he is inwardly exalted. By the aid of this almost spiritual pencilling, he can grasp some of those conceptions which would be otherwise dim and shadowy. In this world we do not need intellect nor truth, but that power that will excite the soul and fasten it on the truth and beauty with which its own depths and all objective nature are filled.

Now it is in vain to say that this is mere fancy, a momentary impression which exerts no practical effect on the heart and life. A man may be educated for heaven by the reflex influence of the thoughts and aspirations of his own soul, as truly as by a precept or an objective motive. The more pure and elevated one's feelings are on any subject, the more laden his mind is with all the symbols of grace and beauty, the more able he will be to resist the allurements to evil by which he is beset.

No true Protestant would, indeed, undertake to apologize for the creations of taste and art in Italy, so far as they misinterpret or confound Scriptural truth, or inculcate theological error, or excite unworthy passions and criminal desires. In the reformed and better age, which, we believe is coming, all such productions will be swept away, or estimated, as we now estimate the fables of the Greek mythology. In that better period, too, these pursuits will not usurp a place which does not belong to them, but will assume their appropriate and subordinate position. But till that purer state of society arrives, the Roman Catholic church in Italy will continue to rest on the Fine Arts as one of its surest foundations. The growth of ages, what is so incorporated into the habits and feelings, associated with the most affecting periods of human life, the most touching offices of the church and the holiest recollections of history, will not be easily relinquished.

Besides, there are powerful influences in the Protestant world, which are coincident and corroborating. The ritual and the practices of the Lutheran Communion on the continent of Europe are but very partially reformed. Many of their church edifices can with difficulty be distinguished from the papal. Much of the finest poetry of the present day, the best of the romances, and of the most splendid essay

writing lend all their charms and power in strengthening the very tendency on which the Papal system reposes. The claims of theological truth and the great interests of mankind are made to yield to the charms of diction, to poetic fancy or to a false liberality. The worshippers of the fine arts in most of the Protestant countries of Europe were never more numerous or enthusiastic than they are at this moment, never more willing to sacrifice truth to outward beauty, never more willing to promote by their example, what in profession they would disown. The fascinations of genius are in some instances, an apology for what is no more nor less than undisguised sensualism. The pious and Protestant king of Prussia has now in his national collection in Berlin, two or three productions exquisite in art, but which would not be openly exposed in the States of the church in Italy.

5. The system has been sustained by means of the truth which it includes in its creeds and formularies. It is owing to the same reason in part that the Mohammedan faith has been able to maintain an independent existence so long. Truth cannot be wholly buried up. It has a certain innate and recuperative energy. It may be darkened and perverted; it may be mixed with sophisms, or ingeniously explained away, or caricatured; during long ages it may seem to have left the world to a dead formalism or to a malignant fanaticism; yet it secretly operates in some hearts. Like those influences which are at work in the hard, wintry ground, it is silently preparing its forces and will in due time reveal some little spots of cheerful verdure.

The Decrees of the Council of Trent are the authorized standard of the Catholic church. No fault can be found with a considerable portion of these articles, and of the explanations which are subjoined. All Protestant churches would fully accord with important parts of the Confession. Indeed, the creeds of some of the Protestant churches are in a large measure only a translation from the Romish. Unwise explanations, acute and groundless distinctions, the insertion of positive error, the multiplication of unauthorized observances, or even the immoral lives of not a few who administer the system, do not wholly change its nature, cannot entirely exclude its redeeming influence. Not seldom, some individuals, whose hearts have been touched by divine grace, have been able to maintain their ground in the Catholic church, though they have boldly preached some saving truths, and neglected or denounced the pernicious errors by which they were surrounded.

Such appear to be some of the principal reasons for the protracted existence and comparatively flourishing state of the Italian church.

Her errors in doctrine, and her anti-Christian practices find, indeed, a vigorous nourishment in the tendencies of depraved human nature. But unmixed error and superstition, or unadulterated depravity, cannot be the sole cause of the long duration of this church. Her strength lies in the artful commingling of good and evil elements, in having at her command resources for most adroit management, in being able to appeal to some of the most innocent, as well as powerful, tendencies of our nature, in taking advantage of varying events in Providence and of the changing aspects of society, and in being able to point to such men as Bernard and Borromeo, Pascal and Fenelon and the present bishop of Rome, as undoubted proofs of the excellent fruits which the system is fitted to produce.

II. We shall now proceed, in the second place, to adduce some of the causes of the weakness of the Roman Catholic system, especially, though by no means exclusively, as it exists in Italy; and shall enumerate some of the facts which prove that this system is in conflict with the Bible, with sound reason and with the advancement of society, and which assure us of its reformation or its ultimate overthrow.

One preliminary remark is important. The Italian Catholic does not see with our eyes. He does not examine his system through a Protestant medium. His principles of inquiry are not drawn from the inductive philosophy. The priest, educated under a different system of dialectics, is not familiar with that large, round about, common sense of which Locke writes, and which we are accustomed to apply to a religious system. We are sometimes amazed that a Roman Catholic does not look at a church question as we are taught to examine it. In his religious services, we may continually witness scenes so trivial and contemptible, that we are astonished at the gravity of the principal performers, and at the gullibility of the awe-stricken crowd. But the Romish priest is trained to substitute ingenuity for argument, plausible suppositions for facts, subtle discrimination for solid reasoning. There is indeed little common ground between the Protestant and Catholic theologian. The mind of the latter has been trained for ages in a manner so unlike that of an intelligent Protestant, that it seems to be a hopeless task to try to overthrow the Catholic hierarchy by argument. So it is with the mass of the devotees. They seem to have lost or never possessed the power to perceive what is ludicrous or utterly trivial. But while we pity their credulity, they are grieved at our infidelity or shocked at our irreverence and the frigid unconcern which we exhibit in witnessing the celebration of the most awful mysteries of their faith.

These considerations should teach us to judge of the Romish practices with all Christian candor and charity; they may also lead us to moderate our expectations of the very speedy overthrow of the system. It has such a tenacious hold of the senses and the imagination, the hopes and the fears of the people, that the process of extinguishing it, or of thoroughly reforming it, may be difficult and protracted.

1. The Roman Catholic system is not favorable to the industry and physical prosperity of a State. No comparison is more fair, none can be less easily set aside than that which is often instituted between the principal Protestant and Catholic countries of Europe. The argument is open and read of all men; it cannot be met, nor its force evaded. Protestantism is favorable to the temporal prosperity of nations; Roman Catholicism is not, or in proportion as it is, it departs from its spirit and usages.

The reasons of this contrast are perfectly obvious. The general influence of the Papacy in repressing freedom of thought, independence of opinion, the sense of personal responsibility, the motives to individual exertion, is not confined to the territory of morals and religion; it has extended over the entire physical life, all the departments of industry and action. If the members of a community are not allowed to think on questions affecting their spiritual interests, they will be apt to be sluggish and thriftless in all which pertains to their temporal well-being.

Again, through its innumerable festivals and holy-day observances, Romanism essentially interferes with habits of industry and the regular business of life. The command, "Six days shalt thou labor," is interpreted to mean, "three or four days shalt thou labor; all the rest shall be fasts or holidays." The number of canonized saints on its calendar is eleven hundred and twenty-eight,[1] the annual festivals of multitudes of whom are celebrated by the church universal, or by large portions of it. The checks upon industry, and the habits of idleness arising from this source, where the fasts and festivals are observed with any degree of strictness, are innumerable.

Besides, the number of ecclesiastics, who pursue no useful occupation, and who are not needed for any spiritual purpose, is enormously great. The city of Rome, with a population of 175,000, has more than three hundred churches and one ecclesiastic to every thirty of its population.[2] The kingdom of Naples, not including Sicily, with a pop-

[1] Catalogue Alphabetique des Saints et Saintes, avec la date de leur mort et de leurs fêtes, Annuaire Historique, Paris, 1847.

[2] The city of Rome, according to the official census, reported in the Augsburgh Allgem. Zeit., 1847, had 54 parishes, 27,532 families, 39 bishops, 1514 priests,

ulation of about six millions, has nearly one hundred thousand priests and persons belonging to the religious orders. The barren island of Sardinia is furnished with one hundred and seventeen convents.

Idleness, rather than positive immorality, is the charge which is most commonly laid at the door of the priesthood in the city of Rome. They are promenading the streets, lounging at the museums and picture galleries, and are not occupied in their appropriate calling. The Roman Catholic church is the mother of idleness as well as of ignorance. The great mass of the population in many parts of Italy are indescribably poor; the property is in the hands of the bankers and of a few other rich men. The vast Campagna near Rome, the immense Pontine marshes lining the Appian Way towards Naples, impregnated with disease and death, would become within two years, in the hands of an Englishman or New Englander, the garden of the world.[1] So far as industry and the true principles of Political Economy take root in a Roman Catholic country, it is by a departure, and only by a departure, from the spirit of the system.[2]

2. The Catholic system is preëminently a materializing system. It measures spiritual truth, to a great extent, according to a gross and earthly standard. It clothes pure and elevated ideas in a garb foreign to their nature, or connects with them mean and repulsive associations. Instead of raising mortals to the skies, it robs angels of their spiritual glory. The sublime and dreadful mysteries of the invisible world, into which the seraphim would fear to intrude, are opened to the vulgar gaze, and are made so definite and mensurable and earthlike, as

---

2471 monks, 1754 nuns, 521 seminaries, and a population of 175,883. Naples, with a population of 360,000, has 300 churches.

[1] In 1797, when the Papal government was overturned by the French, the Board of Public Subsistence exhibited a deficit of 3,293,000 crowns, incurred in retailing bread to the people.

[2] We learned the following facts at Naples in 1847 on the best authority. The government at that time had a complete monopoly of tobacco, salt, playing cards and snow. The last article is considered indispensable. Salt was $2,50 a bushel. The land-tax was sometimes enormously high, amounting to one fourth of a man's income. But it was very unequal, as a small bribe would induce the assessors to lay a light tax on one, while that laid upon another who happened to be absent, or who would not pay the bribe, was ruinous. The country enjoys one of the finest climates and has a most fertile soil, yet there is little general prosperity and little foreign commerce. The state of morals in the city is deplorably low. Pimps abound in the streets, who solicit passengers and strangers to criminal indulgence. According to the testimony of Dr. Cox, an English physician, one fourth of the diseases of males at Naples, is either depending on or complicated with diseases caused by dissipation. Contentions and quarrels frequently occur among different priests and parishes.

to lose their legitimate influence and become nearly transformed into material substances.

Proofs and illustrations of these remarks might be accumulated almost without end. After the communicant makes the sign of the cross at the sacrament he says: "May the body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve my soul to eternal life,"[1]—his body really, truly and substantially. When the last notes of the Sanctus have died upon the ear, a small bell tinkles, and our Lord is physically present on the altar, under the emblems—his literal body and blood are partaken of —a physical, materializing interpretation of Scripture, which is only a specimen of a system which is applied to a large part of the entire volume.

Some of the numerous rules laid down in the Roman Missal for the taking of the sacrament are disgustingly minute, surrounding a spiritual truth with the most familiar and degrading images. Some of the articles are not fit for quotation. "If any one does not fast after midnight," the rubric prescribes, "even after the taking of water only, or of any other drink or food, even in the shape of medicine, and in whatsoever minute quantity, he cannot communicate or celebrate. If the residue of the food remaining in the mouth be swallowed, the residuary particles do not prevent communion, since they are not swallowed after the manner of food. The same is to be said, if in washing the face, a drop of water should be swallowed, contrary to the intention."[1]

So the doctrines of repentance and the forgiveness of sins are miserably degraded by the penances and indulgences of the Romish system, even if we admit the most plausible explanations of the Catholic theologians. The intercourse of the soul of man with its Maker, in its most solemn moments, in the deciding crises of its destiny are tampered with by the arts of a mercenary traffic. Temporal rewards and punishments, if not eternal, are made a marketable commodity.

Over the gateway of many churches in Rome is to be seen posted up the words: "Indulgentia plenaria, perpetua et quotidiana, pro vivis et defunctis." Sometimes the sentence is on a marble slab in the church; sometimes it is a written, framed tablet of parchment, hanging upon a column; sometimes in gilt letters on a metal plate; at others, on a loose printed paper. On the inner wall of the church of St. Sebastian, which stands without the walls on the Appian Way, is a marble inscription which declares that "whosoever shall have entered it (i. e. the catacomb) shall obtain plenary remission of all his

[1] Bishop England's Explanation of the Construction, etc. of a Church, Rome, 1845, p. 144.

sins, through the merits of the one hundred and seventy-four thousand holy martyrs, and of forty-six high pontiffs, likewise martyrs," who were interred there. "So many are the indulgences of the Lateran church," it is declared, "that they cannot in any wise be numbered but by God alone."[1]

The great facts of our future, spiritual existence, so simple and sublime, so incapable of being symbolized by the gross objects of sense, are robbed, in the sermons of the Italian preachers, of their true efficiency, and made to assume the most grotesque, or repulsive, material forms. The Paradise and Gehenna of the Moslems, the Elysium and the Hades of Virgil might find exact counterparts in the discourses of many professed Christian preachers.

Three or four years ago an eloquent Italian friar preached in Rome. His subject was the Last Judgment. And he handled it in a manner to terrify the poor audience to the utmost degree, using every art his imagination could suggest. Sometimes he threw a veil over the Madonna's face, or turned her round, for she moved on a pivot, and exhibited her back to his audience in token of alienation of feeling; sometimes he shook her garments which were black, allusive to the train of thought in which he was indulging; he then produced an iron chain and scourged himself violently with it, the harsh clank of which against the panels of the pulpit, united with the heavy sounds of the ropes with which some of his hearers were lacerating themselves, together with the sobs and shrieks of the females, were terrifying to the firmest nerves.

On the following evening, his subject was Hell. It might have been Omniscience itself that was speaking, so intimate was the knowledge displayed of the secrets of that unknown world. Towards the end of the discourse, he called for a lighted pitch torch, which was in waiting, and deliberately rolling up his sleeve, held his wrist imme-

[1] The following are taken from various churches in Rome. In St. Luigi dei Francesci, "whoever prays for the king of France has ten days of indulgence," by pope Innocent IV. In St. Pietro in Carcere, "S. Sylvester granted every day to those who visited it 1200 years of indulgence, doubled on Sundays and commanded festivals, and besides, every day the remission of a third part of sins." In St. Cosmo and Damian, "Gregory I. granted to all and each one visiting this church of St. Cosmo and Damian, 1000 years of indulgence, and on the day of the station of the same church, the same Gregory granted 10,000 years of indulgence." On a marble slab near the door of the church of St. Saviour di Thermis, is the following: "Indulgences conceded in perpetuity by high pontiffs in this church. Every day of the year there are 1230 years of indulgence; for all Lent there is plenary indulgence; for the pilgrims there is every day plenary indulgence."—*Romanism as it exists in Rome, by the Hon. J. W. Percy*, pp. 48—53.

diately over the flame. Such was the torment, he said, to which every member of the sinner's body would be subjected through all eternity. There was no flinching on the part of the friar, so strongly were his nerves strung; nor was there any deception.[1]

Now this method of exhibiting truth was extraordinary only in degree. It habitually appeals to the inferior part of our nature. It seeks to reduce every proposition to sensible proof. It likes to trust in nothing which cannot be seen and weighed and measured. In short its tendency is to supercede the use of the reason by reducing the highest and most spiritual truths to the level of the outward sense.

3. One of the most striking forms under which Italian Catholicism appears is that of a baptized paganism. It is an extraordinary mixture of Roman polytheism and Christianity. The stranger at Rome can at times with difficulty recollect whether he is walking in the streets of Augustus's Rome or in those of Pius the Ninth. He turns a corner and passes out of Jesus Street and enters Minerva Street. He gazes upon Vespasian's amphitheatre and then listens to a friar preaching in the centre of it. Looking at the inscriptions on the churches, he reads "Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Santa Maria in Lucina, Santo Apollinare, Santo Martino." The saints Cosmo and Damiano are worshipped where there was a temple of Romulus and Remus. A noble building, at this moment nearly perfect, dedicated to Antoninus and his wife Faustina, is now the church of St. Lorenzo. One descends out of a church into the Mammertine prison where Catiline's fellow conspirators were confined. The ancient Romans had a great number of local gods, who presided over particular places or occupations. St. Martin is now the protector of the millers. St. Luke is the patron of sculptors, painters and architects. A likeness of the Madonna, painted by him, says the Roman almanac, exists in the Church of Santa Maria Maggiore. St. Erasmus is the advocate against spasmodic sufferings, St. Rocco against plagues, St. Bonosa against the small pox and St. Martha against epidemic diseases.[2] People take their feeble children to the Church of St. Theodore, at the foot of the Palatine hill, where the Roman matrons formerly dedicated their children to Romulus. On a certain day, the cardinals are seen sweeping up the nave of St. Peter's, in their scarlet robes, in order to kiss the bronze statue of the apostle, which, it is said, was once dedicated to the worship of Jupiter Capitolinus. No Roman Catholic will pass it without going through the ceremony. Three of the toe-nails of the right foot are worn away. Cicero, describing a statue says, that its mouth and chin were somewhat worn, because the people

[1] Rome Pagan and Papal, 1846, p. 244. [2] Ibid. p. 24.

in their prayers and thanksgivings were accustomed not only to worship it, but to kiss it. On the left side of the Church of St. Mary, on the Capitoline hill, are exposed at Christmas, two images of Augustus and the Cumaean Sibyl, respectively, in memory of the popular tradition, that the Sibyl predicted the birth of our Saviour, and that Augustus, therefore, erected an altar to her memory. Particular churches in Rome are filled with votive offerings, from penitent criminals, or from those who have escaped various dangers. The ancient mariner vowed to Castor and Pollux, or to Neptune; the shepherd dedicated his pipe to Pan; the poet vowed to Apollo, and the successful general to Jupiter Feretrius.

Nothing is more striking than a Roman Catholic funeral, especially when it occurs about midnight. The body, placed on a bier, is borne on men's shoulders, with the face exposed. Two files of hooded monks, chant the offices for the dead in a low and melancholy tone, each bearing a gleaming torch. The exact counterpart of this might have been witnessed in Rome two thousand years ago. The pagan brought an animal or the fruits of the earth as an offering on the altar. He performed a lustration with water and incense. He supplicated Vesta and Janus with grain and wine. The Christian brings a composition, which to the senses, appears to be nothing but flour and water, but which, as he asserts, is the very body of the Lord Jesus.

Christmas is the Saturnalia of the Romans; New year's day too was a day of great account in ancient Rome, and it is equally so in modern Rome. The Carnival is a representation, in innumerable particulars, of the Saturnalia, and the Bachanalian Lupercalia of the ancients.[1]

---

[1] The Carnival commences on Saturday and continues eleven days, excepting the two Sabbaths and Friday. A long and straight street—the Corso—is filled with masked persons, soldiers, horses and carriages, slowly passing in two lines and then returning again. The maskers are decked in all kinds of fantastic garments, women's clothes, horns on their heads, tails sticking out of their bodies, occasionally pretending to drink out of empty bottles in their hands, reeling as if intoxicated, etc. In each of the carriages are from two to eight or ten persons, largely provided with flowers tied together in knots, and with little balls made of lime in the form of sugar-plums. These flowers and balls are thrown with great vigor into the balconies and windows of the houses, or into the faces of those who are in the streets, and are returned in large measure from every direction. In some cases half-pints or pints of these plums are poured down in rapid succession upon the heads and faces of persons passing. This most grotesque scene, in which the whole population of the eternal city seems to be engaged, is finally closed by the racing through the street of five or six poor horses, without riders, urged on by the shouts of the people and by little goads or nails, fastened to tin plates which they wear.

In defence of this identification of the customs and usages of Pagan and Christian Rome, the Catholic maintains that the demon has been exorcised, the polytheistic rite has been sanctified, and that the vicegerent of the Almighty has laid his holy hands on the heathenish symbol and converted it into an instrument to God's glory. Christianity has thus obtained a visible and tangible victory over the ancient faith, more impressive than if the objects of this idolatry had been all extirpated.

But this confident advocate forgets that a law of the human mind is stronger than a decree of the pope; that none of his blessings or imprecations can annul or disturb the association of ideas. The imperial statue, the pagan rite, how many times soever the holy chrism has been poured upon them, will suggest the forbidden idolatry, may invite to a repetition of the unholy act.

This perpetuation of the old polytheism, this amalgamation of the rites of idolatry and of the Christian faith, constitutes one of the weakest points of the Romish system. It is a crude mixture, a heterogeneous conglomeration of particles which have no affinity. Pure Christianity indignantly spurns the compromise, disclaims all this attempted fusion of contrary elements, and will stand, if at all, on its independent simplicity.

4. Again, the Roman Catholic system, in some of its aspects, is preëminently childish and unreasonable. If its most earnest efforts had been directed to dissociate the understanding and faith, to separate belief from common sense, it could hardly have succeeded more perfectly. The tax which it practically lays on the credulity of human nature is almost incredible. This childish superstition would not be extraordinary, if it were confined to the unreasoning and illiterate multitude, or if it were exclusively seen in retired villages, or secluded country churches. Our commiseration would in that case be excited for the dupes of these wretched delusions. But when the most renowned churches of the metropolis of the world are the selected scenes of this jugglery; when the Holy Father himself and his most enlightened servants give the sanction of their authority and presence, in the nineteenth century, to fables, to alleged miracles of the most ludicrous and lying character, the pity ends in astonishment that a system with such elements could have survived a thousand years, in a country that claims to be the great source of civilization, and the central seat of the Christian faith.

On one of the days in January, 1847, the Church of St. Andrea delle Fratte, near the college of the Propaganda, was filled repeatedly; every individual of the throng, apparently, except a few foreigners,

went up to the priest, successively, and kissed a bone, said once to have belonged to the patron saint of the church. Not a few of the elite of the city, as well as the poor peasantry, were there. Children of a few months old were brought in to touch the mysterious relic. Those who were particularly devout had the privilege of kissing the fragment twice or thrice.

On the Coelian hill, just inside of the southern wall of Rome, stand two of the seven Basilican churches of Rome, St. John Lateran and the Holy Cross in Jerusalem. The view from the top of St. John Lateran has no equal in Rome, perhaps not on earth. There are but few modern buildings in the vicinity to mar the prospect. The ruins of old Rome rear their ivy-crowned summits, or crumble all around with a most melancholy impressiveness. On the west, beyond the Coliseum, the arch of Titus and the Palatine, the Tiber flows into the blue Mediterranean, both river and sea perfectly distinct. On the north-west, is the Roman forum, bounded by the Tarpeian rock and the Capitoline. On the north and north-east is the modern city, crowned by that one imperial dome. Far beyond, the prospect is limited by the single mountain—still in the winter, "alta stet nive candidum," the lyric poet's Soracte. On the east and south-east, bright in the sun's setting rays, are the Sabine hills, Tusculum, Preneste and other objects so famous in Latin story. On the south, stretches away the undulating Campagna, traversed by the old aqueducts with their vast arches, and dotted by the mouldering fragments of a buried world. Here, if anywhere, it would seem, the churches should be built in all purity and simplicity—the chosen seats of a worship befitting the locality, lifting the soul to Him, who, while he sees mighty empires decaying beneath, is himself from everlasting to everlasting. Yet these two churches are the selectest receptacles of superstition and impious fraud; of relics which are an insult to the human understanding, and which pour contempt on the great doctrine of the resurrection of the body.

On a tablet hanging to one of the columns of the tabernacle over the high altar in St. John Lateran, is a list of the relics which are there preserved. Some of them are as follows: part of the arm of St. Helen, mother of Constantine; part of the bones of Salome, mother of John; a finger of St. Catharine of Siena; part of the brain of St. Vincent of Paul; the head of Zacharias, father of John the Baptist; the cup in which John the apostle drank poison by command of Domitian; part of his garments, and of the chain with which he was bound when he came from Ephesus to Rome; part of the chin of John the Baptist; part of our Lord's cradle at Bethlehem, and of the

napkin with which he wiped his hands after the supper; one of the thorns of the crown; part of the sponge, and of the blood and water which flowed from his side. In this church is also the veritable table around which our Lord and his disciples reclined when the supper was instituted.

In the Church of the Holy Cross, a few rods east, is a parchment list suspended on the wall on the right of the apsis. Here it will be decorous to quote only some items. Among them is the finger of St. Thomas, with which he touched the most holy side of our Lord, the same finger being preserved at four other churches; the altar of St. Helen, so holy that only the pontiff and one cardinal can celebrate there; a great part of the holy veil and of the hair of the virgin; and one bottle of the most precious blood of our Lord.

In this church, also, are the stone on which the angel stood when he announced the incarnation; the stone where the Lord wrote the law on Mt. Sinai; some of the manna of the desert; part of the rod of Aaron which budded; and relics of eleven of the Hebrew prophets.[1]

Between these two churches, and near St. John Lateran, is a building of singular form, partly resembling a church and partly a house, with an open portico in front. Within this portico, are three flights of steps. The middle flight—the Santa Scala—is that by which Jesus entered the palace of Pilate. The steps are made of marble, and covered with wood to guard against their further destruction. How they were brought there is a matter of devout conjecture. Sometimes more than two hundred persons are seen at a time ascending upon their knees this middle flight. Protestants are permitted to walk up and down the other two, though these are thought to have imbibed a portion of sanctity. Under the Sacra Confessione in St. Peter's Church, encircled by a beautiful balustrade, composed of marbles, and decorated with more than one hundred superb lamps continually burning, the mortal remains of the great apostle of the church repose. In the Diario Romano, for 1847, we read, "in the churches of Ara-Coeli, Francesco a Ripa and others, is performed the function of the replacement of the Holy Infant, Jan. 6." This image was said to be miraculously painted a flesh color, and it is held in the highest veneration by the citizens of Rome.

The contradiction and absurdities into which this relic-worship leads would be astounding were they found in any other connection than that of the Roman Catholic church. It may not be inapposite to quote a few of the details.

[1] See the complete lists of these relics in the churches, also in the common descriptions of Rome, e. g. *Percy's Romanism*, p. 82.

The body of St. Andrew is worshipped at Constantinople, Amalfi, Toulouse, in Russia, at the convent of the apostles in Armenia, without reckoinng a sixth head of the apostle which may be kissed at Rome. The body of St. James is venerated at Compostella, Verona, Toulouse, Pistoie and Rome, without mentioning a sixth head which is carried in procession at Venice, and a seventh which is preserved in the abbey of Arras in France. There are eight bodies of Luke, eighteen of Paul, and thirty of St. Pancratius in as many different cities. Constantinople formerly claimed to have possession of St. Peter's body, except the head which was left at Rome. His relics are venerated in the abbey of Claude in France and in the convent of Cluny at Arles. There is a finger in the monastery of the Three churches in Armenia, a thumb at Toulouse, and three teeth at Marseilles. The chair in St. Peter's church in which that apostle exercised his office, is said to have been examined by the profane French soldiers when they had possession of Rome, who copied the inscription, namely, "There is but one God and Mohammed is his prophet." The chair was probably among the spoils of the Crusaders.

There is another account which seems to show that there have been at least two chairs exhibited, each as identically the chair which St. Peter used. On the 18th of January, 1688, when the chair was cleaning, in order to be set up in some conspicuous place in the Vatican, there unluckily appeared carved upon it, the twelve labors of Hercules. Giacomo Bartolini, who was present at the discovery, affirms that their worship was not misplaced, since it was paid, not to the wood, but to the prince of the apostles. Another distinguished author attempted to explain the labors of Hercules in a mystical sense, namely, as emblematical of the future exploits of the popes.[1]

5. The Roman Catholic system, particularly as it is seen in Italy, is throughout in all its parts and in all its aspects, a religion of symbols, a system of types or sensible signs. The Romish ritual, the ceremonial, interminable in length, every part of a church, every article of the sacerdotal dress, every fringe on that dress, every provision which is made for man's spiritual nature from the cradle to the grave, in the most minute particulars, are significant, are crowded with a mystic importance. Myriads of instructors start up on every side, who will never allow the poor man to think an original thought, or step once out of the charmed circle.

The crucifix is placed on the centre of the altar where the bloody immolation is to be made; candles are lighted; by their blaze exhib-

[1] See Lady Morgan's Italy, and the Treatise by Dr. A. Sheler, on the question, Was St. Peter ever at Rome? London, 1846, pp. 117, 118.

iting the descent of the Holy Spirit in the form of fiery tongues; the altar must be of stone representing the rock of salvation; the vestment must be white on the festival of those saints who, without shedding their blood, gave their testimony by the practice of exalted virtues; red on the festivals of martyrs; violet in times of penance; green on those days when there is no special solemnity; and black on Good Friday. In the alb of the priest the beholders see the white robe in which the Saviour was clothed when he was sent back by Herod to Pilate. The cincture reminds the faithful of the cord which bound the innocent victim. The stole is significant of the manner in which the Saviour was fastened to the cross; it forms a kind of yoke on the shoulders, reminding the wearer of Jesus who can enable him to bear his cross. The handkerchief suggests to the congregation the cord by which the Lamb of God was bound to the pillar when he was scourged. Another vestment represents the seamless coat of Christ.[1]

Thus it is in innumerable particulars, in a thousand branches and ramifications of this cumbrous system. It does not address the reason, it speaks to the eye; it does not lead to profound meditation; it kindles the fancy. It discourages all liberal inquiry, all manly investigation, all independent training.[2] It is founded on the assumption that the human race is to be forever in its childhood, always to be wrapped in its swaddling bands, never to go beyond its elementary lessons, never to be disengaged from the hand of its teacher, never to come into the glorious freedom of the children of God. It is, in many of its aspects, Judaism carried out into detail, omitting that common sense and those lofty views which characterize the earlier Economy. Now the question is, Will the world, will Italy, always be in bondage to these beggarly elements? to the provisions of an introductory dispensation, now utterly barren and effete? The question needs only to be stated to be answered. As surely as civilization and knowledge increase, some of the most objectionable characteristics

[1] See Bishop England's "Explanation," passim.

[2] "The church requires of her children, that they shall conform their minds to that meaning, which has been received in the beginning with the books themselves, from their inspired compilers; and that they will never take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of those fathers, who in every age have given to us the uninterrupted testimony of this original signification. She knows of no principle of common sense, or of religion, upon which any individual could, after the lapse of centuries, assume to himself the prerogative of discovering the true meaning of any passage of the Bible to be different from that which is thus testified by the unanimous declaration of the great bulk of Christendom."—*Bishop England.*

of the Romish system must be abandoned. The contrast between them and Christianity is as great as it is between the Mishna and the New Testament.

6. Again, the Roman Catholic system is based on the interpretation or the misinterpretation of a very few picked passages of the Bible. This is obvious, not only in her written Apologies, but upon and within her churches; in the inscriptions on her altars; in her monumental tablets for the dead; on her memorial crosses by the road side, and wherever she has been able to affix her watchwords. The text declaring the supremacy of St. Peter, "Tu es Petrus et super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam, et tibi dabo claves regni coelorum," is written in colossal letters of gold upon a purple ground within the dome of her metropolitan temple. The one passage in which auricular confession finds its authority, is rung upon by a thousand changes. One isolated passage, ever on the lips of the priest, is the invariable support of the mysterious transubstantiation. Indeed it may be said to rest on the monosyllable. From a solitary declaration, is derived the power of the priest to absolve the sinner. The perpetual virginity of Mary is inferred from half a verse, which by natural implication, teaches the direct contrary. The celibacy of the clergy has its basis on a few passages which, according to the declarations of the inspired writers themselves, had only a local and temporary application. The doctrine of penances appeals to the mistranslation of a single Greek noun.

Now it is hardly necessary to say that any system of religious doctrine or of church government which can find no wider support must ultimately fall. No Christian hierarchy can stand which shrinks from an examination of any portion of the Scriptures, or which puts forth its claims on the strength of a few passages which are severed from their context. It is the glory of Protestantism that it has no favorite chapters and verses. It stands or falls on the spirit of the entire volume, on the widest induction of particulars, on the consentaneous support of all the sacred writers, and of all which they declare. It pretends to no darling apostle, to no artfully culled symbols; it shrinks from no argument, is afraid of no catechizing, never arrays faith against reason, and relies on that same broad, common sense interpretation of the Bible, which our great jurist would apply to the constitution of his country.

7. We may infer, finally, the ultimate downfall, or the essential reformation of the Roman Catholic system in Italy, from the character and history of the present pontiff.

When the historian Niebuhr was in Rome, about thirty years ago,

he said that the Italians were a nation of walking dead men. It is so no longer. About two years since, there was a concerted night celebration of the former expulsion of the Austrians from Genoa. The mountain tops, which no police men could reach, were at one and the same moment in a blaze. These midnight fires responding from summit to summit, were but a symbol of the fires that were burning in a nation's breast. It was the signal of the reunion, of the renationalizing of the Italian State. It had found in one name, as it thought, a binding watchword, in one man a living impersonation of its spirit. Pius the Ninth was not elected by accident. He did not owe his elevation to the intrigues of the French ambassador, or to a misapprehension of his character on the part of the conclave. He was elected because he had served in a civil employment before he became a priest; because he was a native of the liberal, the Adriatic side, of the Peninsula; because men had confidence in his frank, open and good face; in short, because he was the antipodes of that aged bigot, Gregory XVI.[1] Pius the Ninth was chosen because he would open the prison doors and let the captive go free; because it was hoped that he would do that which had so often, and in so many places, been attempted in vain, for which torrents of patriot blood had been shed, for which Austrian dungeons had been filled and thousands of exiles had wandered in distant lands. His election was a necessity of the times, to which a thousand influences had been for many years converging. A second Gregory could not have worn the mitre six months. No college of cardinals, or fortress of St. Angelo, or inherited sanctity could have saved him. The Roman States would have had a liberal pope, or the chair of St. Peter would have been left vacant.

What are, and what probably will be the consequences of his elevation, or what change will be effected either under his guidance, or in opposition to his will?

First, the idea of the pope's infallibility as a temporal or a spiritual prince has been rudely assailed, and can with difficulty ever regain its ascendancy. The absurdity of it is subjected to constant and most humiliating tests. So doubtful has it become, so ill fitted is it to meet the sudden emergencies of the present times, so extensively is its inefficiency known and canvassed, that its former strenuous advocates, as it should seem, must abandon it.

Secondly, the adoption of those civil and municipal reforms in the States of the church and throughout Italy which are most urgently

[1] It is said that this pope punished capitally in sixteen years, in a population of less than three millions, three hundred persons, and incarcerated, mostly for political offences, not less than thirty thousand.

needed. The days of misgovernment, of legalized oppression, of exclusive aristocratic pretension, and of a wretched serfdom, converting some of the fairest districts in the world into a desert, are fast passing away. Rome, if she would retain a tithe of her power, must practise the lessons of industry and a wise economy.

Thirdly, the separation of the civil and ecclesiastical power. This is virtually effected already. The pope at the present moment is an ecclesiastical sovereign and no more. It is not the cardinal legate who governs Bologna; it is the citizens themselves. It is not the pope who sends his troops into Lombardy or who disbands the Swiss guard, or exiles the company of Jesus; it is public opinion, acting through laymen at Rome. The country of Brutus and Cicero and Rienzi, which, three years ago, was a despotism as absolute as any which existed on earth, is now virtually a republic.

Fourthly, the immediate introduction, to some extent, of Protestant opinions, of free discussion on matters of religion and of an unrestricted press. The light has hitherto been systematically shut out. For ages an embargo has been laid on everything which would disturb the Catholic belief. The ports and custom-houses of Italy have sought to exclude Protestant opinions as zealously as they would the infection of the plague.[1] But this peremptory exclusion, it is to be hoped, is at an end. The Index Expurgatorius will, probably, be hereafter nothing but an historical curiosity on the shelves of the Vatican. Even should the hopes of the friends of civil liberty be disappointed, and the Austrian supremacy be again restored in Lombardy, still, it would be difficult, if not impracticable, to reïnstate the old system of papal exclusiveness. Vienna herself feels the quickening breath of freedom. This beautiful land, there is good reason to believe, will not again become the theatre of Jesuit intrigue and of inquisitorial cruelty. Whether monarchy, in a limited form, again obtain the ascendancy or not, the cause of Protestant liberty has received an accession of strength which must ere long sweep away all obstacles.

Fifthly, we may also hope that some of the more objectionable and comparatively modern features of the Roman Catholic system will be abandoned. An economical or civil reformation must modify, in a va-

[1] Three or four years ago, a gentleman found it impossible to procure a Bible in the vernacular tongue at any of the book-shops in Rome. In 1846–7, no copy of an Italian Bible could be found for sale in several of the largest cities of the country, except that of Martini, which is in several volumes octavo. Now it is stated in the public prints, that parts of the Bible, the Westminster Assembly's Catechism, extracts from the writings of Vinet and of other Protestants, are translated into Italian and freely distributed.

riety of ways, some of the practices and doctrines of the papacy. Certain usages and articles of belief cannot endure the ordeal which emancipated reason, popular education, or an enfranchised Bible would of necessity establish. The right of private judgment in matters of religious belief always accompanies the diffusion of the Scriptures, and must with the blessing of Heaven essentially reform, if it does not gradually destroy the Catholic hierarchy.

The degree of freedom which the Vaudois, who dwell in the mountains of Piedmont, after ages of persecution, now enjoy, and which has made a hundred Alpine vallies break forth into singing, is but an earnest, we trust, of that perfect liberty in Christ which shall ere long prevail from sea to sea, and from the Lombard Plain to the utmost South. Then it will be, indeed, fair Italy—sublime and graceful in outward nature, with the larger air, the purple light, and a sun sinking into the sea with a lustre peculiarly his own, full of old reminiscences that stir the soul to its depths, the parent of freedom, the home of art, the nurse of genius in its noblest forms, the guardian of those whose "dust is immortality," where sleeps on Ravenna's shore one who spake of "things invisible to mortal eye," where was revealed to another all deathless ideals of beauty, where apostles and martyrs still repose united to Jesus, where Ambrose sung and Augustine saw the vision of the city of God, whose very soil is instinct with thought, whose "ashes are yet warm,"—how fair she will be when there are no sad contrasts in her moral and religious state, when the spirit that once evangelized the eternal city shall again pervade her plastic, susceptible and most interesting people, when from all her vine-crowned hills and delicious valleys, the ransomed of the Lord shall return and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy.

ARTICLE II.

REMARKS ON A SERMON DELIVERED BY THE LATE DR. EMMONS OF FRANKLIN BEFORE THE NORFOLK EDUCATION SOCIETY, DORCHESTER, JUNE 11, 1817.

By Rev. Leonard Withington, Newbury, Ms.

The reputation of Dr. Emmons as a theologian has been destined to undergo all that variety which arises from the different degrees of attention which the public has been disposed to pay to his works. He has made his first, his second and his third impression on the public mind; his first impression was a strong, and, perhaps we may add, a blind admiration from his own little school of followers, and deep condemnation from the rest of the religious world; then came a time when his principles were generally discussed; and, while every body accorded him the excellence of a most luminous style and a clear perception of the conclusions to which he was to arrive, together with their connection with the premises, still he was regarded by many as a writer of perverse ingenuity, more pleased with a paradox than a common truth, never startled at his own conclusions, if he could support them with a seeming demonstration; in a word, a man who was willing to waste his powers on recondite subtleties rather than in promoting useful knowledge or practical piety. We believe his works are fast making their third, and, perhaps, permanent impression. We hear it suggested, and we fully accord with the suggestion, that few men stand as fair a chance, among New England authors, to be a classic as he. He had a double soul; he was not a mere *Elève* of the Hopkinsian school; he uttered truths deep as the foundations of human thought, and lasting as eternity. He wanted nothing to make him one of the profoundest of reasoners but a more extensive acquaintance with the history of human speculation. Most of the Hopkinsians, we suspect, were men of great acuteness but of narrow erudition. They went over ground already beaten and were sometimes deceived by sophistries which the world had rejected; still they were bold, whole-souled men, and among them, none stood higher than the sage of Franklin. He was a perfect emanation of New England; close in his attention, deep in his insight, true to his convictions; earnest, consistent, luminous and sincere. We have heard him indeed censured for not knowing, or not distinguishing the cases when the pre-

mises support the conclusion from those in which the conclusion upsets the premises. But in this respect, Berkeley was more bold and paradoxical than he. Certainly no man can read him without many suggestions, which a mind far less fertile than that of the author of them, may work into permanent and useful truths.

The sermon on which we shall attempt a few remarks, was delivered more than thirty years ago. It is one of the happiest productions of the author. As Dr. Emmons never wrote without an aim, we are inclined to think that he had in view some opinions then growing into fashion, which he regarded, at least, as partial errors. Possibly he might have had Andover in view. Possibly it may be said, that he had very little knowledge of the science which he seems to depreciate—Biblical Criticism. The sermon may be regarded as one of the most beautiful specimens of friendly severity ever offered to a rival whom, by admonishing, we mean to correct. Dr. Emmons was not one of the soft souls that wind wreathes of roses around the victims they mean to sacrifice; nor was he a malignant man, whose object is pain and whose wounds are mortal. But such he was, both for morals and discernment, that, whenever he speaks, he deserves attention.

The prevalent doctrine, in some of our seminaries, when this discourse was delivered (and perhaps it still continues to be the same) was, that we must come to the Bible for theological knowledge, just as we come to the phenomena of nature for natural, with the mind dissociated from all its previous biasses and conceptions, a mere *tabula rasa*, and derive our system not from human creeds, but from the inspired volume; as Chalmers says, we must take our grammar and dictionary and interpret the Bible just as if we knew nothing before. The only corypheus we must adopt, is not systems, but history, customs, laws and manners; and your system must be your *last conclusion;* the suggestion of certain kinds of knowledge which have no system involved in them; that is, you must go through a long forest, without a ray of light, until you reach the further verge, and then it seems to be implied that the sunshine will break suddenly upon you. Long suspense was to lead you to conclusion, and painful doubt to happy solution. The public mind was then passing from the dogmatic teaching of a previous day to the new element; and no wonder if it did not stop at the middle point of truth and wisdom. It was at this time, that Dr. Emmons, who loved such an office, uttered this astonishing paradox: "No man, I believe, ever has formed, or ever can form, a consistent scheme or system of divinity from the Bible alone, without the aid of some systematical writer or instructor." See Ser-

mon, page 18. And again: "The knowledge of sacred history and biblical philology is very different from the proper knowledge of divinity." We remember the astonishment and even disgust with which these opinions were then by many received. And we must confess with some shame that we shared in the general censure. But time and observation have wrought a great revolution in our own mind. No doubt there is plausibility and even truth in placing creeds and systems far below the Bible in point of authority. But we are almost equally sure that Dr. Emmons uttered not only a paradoxical opinion but a salutary truth.

It is not true that *each individual* must be expected to derive all his opinions originally from the Bible; that is a task too mighty for any power short of the collected sagacity of the whole race. No doubt human opinions should be based wholly on the Bible. But the Bible is a deep book, an ancient book; and, like all other wise books, it has a latent system, which, when once discovered, harmonizes all its doctrines and pours light on every page. It has its λόγος, as the Platonists say—that is, a reigning thought, a harmonizing idea, which is above all language and by which language itself must be understood. Now until a man seizes this reigning idea, he is in a mist; he is like a mariner on a wide sea, without a polar star or compass; he is obliged to anticipate this λόγος—this predominant object as soon as possible. It is so necessary to him that in all successful investigations, in all explanations of dark and difficult treatises, the reader is obliged to adopt and abandon several false suppositions before he reaches the true. For nothing can be interpreted until the main end of interpretation is assumed and surmised, just as Columbus conjectured the existence of the Western world and even, in some degree, its direction, before he could possibly steer to find it. "In the beginning," says John, "was the word and the word—λόγος—was with God and the word was God." Without denying the personality of the word, we may say, that the system of which Christ was the incarnation, is latent in the first pages of the Bible and blazes on and illumines the last.

Comparisons are often taken from philosophy; and it is said that we must interpret the Bible as we investigate the laws of nature; bringing a blank mind to the light presented. But how is it in the kingdom of nature? For ages, God in his works as he has in his word, presented his truth in the most simple symbols to the human mind; that is, simple to him that has once received the key. For ages, the stars had glittered in the sky to the eye of the ancient astronomers, as they did to those of Kepler or Newton; and yet, for the want of the true key, these symbols were not understood. Let a man but

once whisper to an observer the Copernican system, and it saves him years of labor; his own observation then verifies the suggestion. In like manner, I can imagine an intelligent man on a desolate island; he is instructed in all science but that of religion; the Bible is washed up on shore in a sailor's chest; and he reads it. He is simple-hearted and wishes to know the truth. I will not say that he reads it in vain; he may gain much devotional and fragmentary knowledge. Nay, you may pour upon him all the light of history and biblical criticism, and yet I can imagine this man to read the Bible as much in vain for completing a theological system, as Timaeus or Hipparchus or any other old astronomer, looked in vain at the stars to find the integral order in which they moved. The truth is, we have no right to reject the common strength of our species and presumptuously throw ourselves on our own. And what is a creed or a system but a method which a large party, and perhaps the whole church, have judged to be the doctrinal key to the Bible. So far is it from being an impediment to impartial investigation, that I should rather read the Bible with the poorest system ever known, the Manichean, the Valentinian, or the Socinian, than none at all. Even the Ptolomaic error in astronomy was not an useless guide to final truth.

Most of the religious systems in the world present us with some leading idea, of which two things may be said. 1st. It is derived from a professed interpretation of the Bible, and 2nd. It is applied to the interpretation of other passages; just as Newton said, that the sum of philosophy is to derive the laws from the phenomena of nature, and then we apply these laws to interpret new phenomena.[1] The Socinian says the reigning idea is, to *bring life and immortality to light,* to encourage man to virtue. The Arminian says, that free agency and a sense of obligation is the prime conception. The Universalist declares, the annunciation of God's determination to save all, irrespective of any connection with duty, is the leading thought; and the Calvinist says, free grace, justification by faith and its concomitant truths, beam on every page. Now one or the other of these systems will steal into the mind and govern the views of interpretation of every man who is himself consistent and supposes the Bible to be so. If the honest reader finds that one of these reigning ideas fails to harmonize the various parts of revelation he must reject it, just as Kepler rejected (so much to his honor) various false hypotheses which he had adopted to harmonize the celestial motions. But let no man fear the early

[1] Newton's exact words are: Omnis philosophiae difficultas in eo versari videtur, ut a phoenomenis motuum investigemus vires naturae, deinde ab his viribus demonstremus phoenomena reliqua.

adoption of systems; for as the author of this sermon has admirably asserted: "It is said that systems of divinity tend to prevent men from forming any real opinions of their own, and to infringe on the right of private judgment. This consequence no more flows from reading systematical writings than from reading any other books, or attending on any other theological instructions. The reason is, a man's opinions are as much his own, if he derives them from another, as if he derives them from his own research and examination. No man can be said to have a real opinion upon any subject, which is not derived from evidence; and if it be derived from evidence, it is totally immaterial whether he derives the evidence from his own investigation, or from conversation, or from reading, or from public or private instruction." Sermon, page 16. We may add, that every man *has* some conception of the leading ideas of revelation, and it is a miserable affectation to pretend that his mind is a *tabula rasa*, and then call this vacancy, impartiality.

The view taken in the foregoing remarks is abundantly verified in the history of the church. It is curious to see how the general mind coöperates with the individual; how the accumulated knowledge of a past age, like leaven, ferments and shapes the speculations of a subsequent period. We everywhere see a *tendency* which becomes more manifest in a final *result*. True orthodoxy, in its human development, shines not on the world like the sun, from a single majestic light, extinguishing all the inferior luminaries, but like the moon, surrounded by a host of assisting stars, which pour their united radiance on the spectator's eye. How was it with respect to the Trinity? That doctrine did not receive its definite shape until the Council of Constantinople was held. Even Athanasius is hardly sound in the symbols to which he gave a manifest tendency. The same may be said of that previous Calvinism, which indeed always existed in the church, undeveloped, untraced as a system, unseen in its unity, unpursued to its consequences; but which emerges and sinks, gleams out and hides itself, is asserted and contradicted in the writings of the fathers before the Pelagian age. This, I know, has been made an objection to the established creed; but certainly it was just so in philosophy, with regard to our most certain doctrines. The truth is, the public mind was constantly forming itself—giving to the individual a key to interpret the Bible by; abridging his labor in his independent investigations; and facilitating his march to truth by showing him the road which the collected labors of all the earnest, the intelligent and the good, had made open and plain before him. If it was necessary that elementary and simple truths should early be revealed to all who were seeking

salvation, it was very natural that SYSTEMATIC TRUTHS should be the discovery of united exertion.

It is strongly to be suspected, and indeed the opinion seems to be gaining ground every day, that even in philosophy the rigid derivation of all knowledge from induction has been pushed too far. *Man is the minister and interpreter of nature.* Be it so. Yet man is himself a system. He brings an implicit system in him when he comes to the interpretation of nature; and if nothing was seen by the independent reason, in vain would the senses observe the operations of the outward world. Take the *three laws* of motion as laid down by Newton as the foundation of his philosophy. Certainly the first of them, perhaps all of them, is such as not to be verified by experiment. They are seen and foreseen as the necessary conditions of all experimental philosophy; and they prove how impossible it is to separate the pure reason which idealizes, from the attentive observation which regulates idealism. The two powers must always be joined. But the inward reason must have a system, or, in stricter language, it *is* a system. It is an implicit, internal system; as the Platonist would call it, a dim vaticination of what is to be; a foreshown certainty that there is a connection in truths, and a forefelt relish for order and consistency. Indeed, in our apprehension, the laws of philosophizing were as well stated by Plato as they were by Bacon. The ancients failed in applying them. Plato, in the changes of the elements, insists upon it, that experiment and observation are perhaps always to be applied: *πρῶτον μὲν οὖν ὑπάρχειν αἴσθησιν δει τοῖς λεγομένοις ἀεί.*—Timaeus, page 61, C. Stallbaum. By *αἴσθησις* I understand *observation assisted by experiment.* And yet, in another part of his dialogue, he makes the GREAT LOCRIAN talk, of forms, or ideas: *ἀναίσθητα ὑφ' ἡμῶν, νοούμενα μόνον.* "If," says he, "true observation differs in nothing from those necessary truths perceived immediately by the mind, then the perceptions of our senses are as sure as the perceptions of our reason. But they are very different in their nature and origin. The one comes by teaching, the other by persuasion or probability; the one from true reason, the other without reason, i. e. without the independent reason; the one convinces without motion, i. e. without occurring in the phenomenal world, the other *after* such occurrence. Every man partakes of the last, but only the gods and a few of mortal race of the first."[1] He concludes, therefore, that there is a department which belongs to the independent reason only: *ὁ δὴ νοήσις εἴληχεν ἐπισκοπειν.* Now the followers of Bacon *almost* deny this last element; and, indeed, great errors have sprung up in

[1] Timaeus, page 51, D. Stallbaum.

investigation in consequence of this denial. When Copernicus thought it necessary to account for the parallelism of the earth's axis by a *positive* cause, and when Leibnitz applied his *sufficient reason* to Newton's first law of motion, they both show in opposite ways the importance of keeping induction in its proper place.[1] In Dr. Brown's famous INQUIRY INTO THE RELATION OF CAUSE AND EFFECT, the whole fallacy of that treatise (and it is almost too gross to be a fallacy) in which he denies the existence of POWER, consists in demanding that *that* should be proved by observation which is obvious without proof to the independent reason: *τοῦτο, ὃ δὴ νόησις εἴληχεν ἐπισκοπεῖν.* Surely the argument *ἐξ ἀνάγκης*, which Plato so often uses, is of *some* force.

When a man goes to the Bible, he has something within him, which meets and corresponds to the system there involved and presented. And, if he is a rational man, his first curiosity will be to form some outlines of the end and aim of the book, which is to enlighten his faith and harmonize his heart. He cannot understand the book in fragments, for he is not himself a fragment; he wishes to catch some glimpse of the central light—the harmonizing whole. The writer of this Article remembers very well when he first went in to see Mr. Catherwood's circular picture of Jerusalem, with what giddy confusion he received the first impression, and with what anxious suspense he asked the question: Where is the mount of Olives? Which way is north? Where is the hill of Evil Council? And he recollects from what perfect chaos, the beauty and order, the satisfaction and delight arose on the observer when the points of the compass were once fixed and the parts of the picture assumed their places. But in an intellectual and moral prospect, it is still more important; for the eye of reason loves order more than that of the senses.

Now there are two learned doctors which give us exactly contrary directions—Dr. Chalmers and Dr. Emmons. Dr. Chalmers says: "In studying your Bible, it is a question of pure criticism—your grammar and your dictionary is all you need." "No," says Dr. Emmons, "you need something more—you are a rational being; you need a system; for you have an implicit system in your own soul." Thus the two doctors contradict each other. Both good men, both wise men, both in earnest—which shall we follow? For my part, I love my country, and reverence the deep voice that comes from its mountains and hills. I go for the American divine. I believe that his decision is ratified by experience, and comes from the depths of

[1] See Playfair's Second Dissertation on the Progress of Mathematical and Physical Science, page 126.

divine truth. The grammar and the dictionary!! Professor Lee may take the one; and Dr. Pearson, if he will rise from the grave, shall swallow the other.

We have heard it suggested that when Dr. Emmons says you "must have a system," he means really to say, "You must be a Hopkinsian before you understand the Bible." But no! we do not believe he meant this. The words had a deeper meaning in his mouth. They might have meant this—possibly—uttered by Dr. Spring.[1] But Dr. Emmons was made a sectarian by his views of truth; he did not view truth through sectarianism. No man was more independent; no man saw the deeper channel of the stream with a more penetrating eye. Besides, he has precluded the charge by an express declaration: "All these doctrines are plainly and confessedly contained in the Gospel, in some sense or other. *I do not pretend to say in what sense*, they are to be understood; but I do not hesitate to say, that they ought to be understood in a sense, which renders them harmonious and consistent with each other." See Sermon, page 5. Read the whole.

It will be easy for any one, whose disposition is jealous and whose proclivity to misapprehension is in proportion to his disposition, to pervert what has now been said to a conclusion, as if revelation were imperfect; and as if human reason must prop up divine authority. But this, I apprehend, was not the design of Dr. Emmons. He would allow that the Bible was perfect; but so is nature. We have no fault to find with her symbols. They were established by a perfect God and partake of his infallibility and perfection. And yet how slowly were they interpreted! How gradually did true philosophy dawn on the world! What I contend for is simply this; that as some glimpses of the true system are sometimes found and are always desirable in interpreting the laws of nature; so in understanding the Bible, THE TRUE SYSTEM IS NEEDED AS A LIGHT TO THE INTERPRETATION. It will never be found unless it is first anticipated; and he is a benefactor who abridges my labor by putting this necessary torch into my trembling hands—

> A little onward lend thy guiding hand
> To these dark steps, a little further on.

And now we would submit with all deference to those whose duty it is to profit by the living and the dead, whether these principles are duly appreciated in our theological seminaries. We have an impression—though it is a very loose one and we bring it forward with infi-

[1] The late Dr. Samuel Spring of Newburyport.

nite caution—that too much time is spent under the *mere* guidance of the grammar and the dictionary. Our youth sometimes become better verbal critics than theologians. I have no doubt of the learning, the earnestness and the sincerity of our accredited teachers. To suggest vague suspicions is a miserable employment. But if there be any danger, let a most acute observer warn us, who is now in his grave.

ARTICLE III.

OF SPIRIT AND THE CONSTITUTION OF SPIRITUAL BEINGS.

By George I. Chace, Prof. of Chemistry and Geology, Brown University.

In a former number of this Review, we laid before its readers, what we believed to be the true view of the constitution of matter. We endeavored to show, that in accordance with the principles of sound logic, it must be regarded as having a real existence, as possessing inherent, constitutional properties, and as acting by virtue of those properties. As such a constitution of matter, would at first view, seem to place all physical events under the control of an iron necessity, leaving no room for the influence of prayer or the exercise of that superintending Providence, which according to the teachings of our holy religion, God continually extends over the affairs of this world, it may be well before entering upon the subject of our present Article, to notice briefly, what, were it true, would constitute so serious an objection to the view taken. In doing so, however, we would say at the outset, that we do not propose considering whether it be possible to reconcile this idea of matter with the above Christian doctrines, but whether it presents in connection with those doctrines, any peculiar difficulties which do not equally attach themselves to any other hypothesis capable of explaining the phenomena. Unless this latter question can be answered in the affirmative, the objection, so far as we are concerned, has no weight.

Now we think it is clear that no practical conclusions whatever can be drawn from the supposition, that all the changes of the external world, are brought about by the spontaneous reaction of the elements composing it, which may not, in like manner, be deduced from that established order which we everywhere observe in the succession

of events, which lies at the foundation of all the sciences, and without which we could have no knowledge beyond the sphere of our own immediate consciousness. The continual manifestations of power, which present themselves on every side to our observation, do not occur isolated, but linked to one another so as to form one continuous chain of antecedents and consequents, extending through every part of nature, and binding together all her phenomena,—a chain which no created power can loose, which only a miracle can break. It is obviously the same thing to us, whether this fixed order in the succession of events, these established connections among phenomena, are constantly maintained by the direct and unceasing exertion of the Divine power, or whether they were at once provided for, and ever after secured in the original constitution of matter. In both cases, too, the phenomena are alike caused by God, are equally an unfolding of his conceptions, a fulfilling of his will. It makes no difference as to the question of a Divine providence or of the influence of prayer, whether we suppose God to be each moment evolving the changes of the universe in accordance with a preconceived plan and in subordination to preëstablished laws, or whether we suppose Him, in the beginning, to have so framed the constitution of things, as to cause the spontaneous development of these changes, in accordance with the same plan and in subordination to the same laws. On either supposition, the subject presents to our understandings difficulties which can be removed only by admitting in the Divine being, a prescience infinitely beyond our powers of comprehension, enabling Him from the beginning to look down the mighty chain of physical events, through all its ramifications and connections, and thus to foresee the little as well as the great, and to provide for the accomplishment of his special as well as his general purposes.

It may be urged as a further objection to our view of the constitution of matter, that it places the Divine being in a state of inactive repose, leaving Him with nothing more to do, after having finished the work of creation.

Were this so, we reply, it would furnish no valid objection to the doctrine. Our knowledge of the Divine nature, and modes of existence and action, is too imperfect; in forming our ideas of them, we are obliged to reason too exclusively from ourselves, to justify us in drawing any conclusions from this source. The teachings of the Holy Scriptures, so far as they may be conceived to have a bearing upon the question, would seem rather to favor the idea of periods of creative energy and labor, succeeded by others of comparative rest. Such at least is the view presented in the account given by the inspired

historian, of the fitting up of our globe for becoming the abode of living beings, and of the formation of the different tribes of plants and animals designed to occupy it. The same idea is also repeatedly alluded to and recognized in other portions of the sacred writings.

But not to press an inference of this kind, beyond what the acknowledged principles of interpretation may be deemed to warrant, we say further, that a state of inactivity or repose on the part of Deity is by no means implied in the doctrine of the real existence of the universe and the spontaneous evolution of its phenomena. There may be, and doubtless are other modes of exerting the Divine power, beside the creation and endowment of material atoms. Of one of these, indeed, we have abundant evidence in the past history of our own planet. Again and again, as we learn from the teachings of modern geology, have the Divine wisdom and power been interposed in the creation of new forms of animal and vegetable life, adapted in their organization to the new conditions which have arisen, one after another, upon the earth's surface, during the slow progress of its gradual and successive developments. Similar interpositions have also taken place at later periods in its history, subsidiary to that moral and social progression, which it seems to have been the purpose of God to establish upon the earth, after having terminated by the formation of man, the long line of physical advances. What has been the history of our own world, in both of these respects, may be the history of innumerable others. Nay further; creation itself, for aught we know, may be a progressive work. In some far off region of space, beyond the reach of human eye, beyond the utmost bound of telescopic vision, away on the outskirts of the existing creation, new worlds, and systems of worlds, may be continually arising, under the fiat of the same almighty power which spake our own into being. And as space is infinite, the boundaries of the universe may go on constantly enlarging, as long as time shall continue, or until they at length shall have reached the limit proposed for them in the Divine mind. But we cannot pursue these thoughts. Enough has been said, we think, to answer fully the objection considered, and it is time we proceeded to an examination of the subject which we have placed at the head of our Article.

When we enter upon the investigation of matter, we have at our command means for determining its constitution and properties, which do not offer themselves, in the case of spirit. We can see and feel it. We can weigh and measure it. We can alter its form. We can change its place. We can demonstrate its presence, or we can prove its absence. We may cause it to enter into combination, or to under-

go decomposition. We may subject it to all the tests of mechanical and chemical experiment.

The case is widely different, however, when we come to the investigation of spirit. This is invisible and intangible. It does not address any of the senses. It has neither weight nor form nor dimensions. Nor does it possess any properties by which we can determine its locality, from which we can prove its absence or demonstrate its presence, in any given place. We have no power over it. We can effect no changes in it. We cannot collect it. We cannot confine it. We cannot subject it to any form of experiment. We can only take note of its phenomena, as they are revealed to us in our own consciousness, or as we see them indicated by the actions of others. We may collect, compare and classify these phenomena. We may refer them to distinct powers or faculties, in the beings by which they are manifested. But we can derive no information from them, concerning the actual principle or essence from which they are evolved. So entirely is this concealed from us, that we are in danger of overlooking its existence, and of referring the manifestations which we witness, to a mere assemblage of powers and capabilities, without considering that those powers and capabilities must have that in which they reside and to which they belong. Indeed, we are inclined to think that most persons, when they endeavor to form a conception of spirit, leave out altogether the idea of substance, and content themselves with coupling a vague notion of energy and power, with the exclusion of every attribute of materiality. Their idea of it, is made up rather of negations, than of any positive qualities. They suppose it to have no form, no extension, to hold none of those relations to space, which necessarily belong to every form of visible, tangible matter. In addition to this, they conceive it to be essentially active, and to possess the attributes of will, memory and affection, which raise it far above all material analogies.

Now that which possesses these, or any of the other properties or endowments of spirit, as a moment's reflection will convince any one, must have a real, substantial existence; an existence as positive and certain as if it could be seen and felt and handled; as unquestionable as if it could be submitted fully to the examination of the senses, and be made the subject of every form of mechanical and chemical experiment. As respects the certainty of their existence, there is no difference between matter and spirit. So far as this is concerned, they both stand upon precisely the same foundation. The real difference between them, and the only real difference, consists in this, that one is more open to our investigations than the other. Of one we may ac-

quire a knowledge. We may become acquainted with its actual constitution and properties. While of the other we can gain no direct or positive knowledge, but must be content with such ideas concerning it, as may be derived from analogy.

But notwithstanding this difficulty of gaining any satisfactory idea of the nature of spirit and of the constitution of spiritual beings, the subject is one which always has had, and always will have, much interest for men of serious and reflective habits; one which always has occupied and always will occupy, a large place in their thoughts. Most of the ancient philosophers, whether of Italy or Greece, of Egypt or Hindoostan, so far as we are able to learn their opinions from the imperfect records that have come down to us, believed the human soul and also the soul or living principle of each one of the lower animals to be a part of the Deity, detached in some way from the Divine substance, and incorporated with the body which it for the time animated. In this fallen and humbled condition, they supposed it liable to contract habits of vice and sin, and as a necessary consequence, to become subject to punishment. With these psychological opinions, they very generally connected the doctrine of metempsychosis. They supposed the same soul to animate in succession different bodies, sometimes of men and sometimes of animals, descending in the scale of being, in proportion as it became more vicious, or ascending according as it made progress in virtue. When at length, it had passed through the entire cycle of its transmigrations, which was commonly supposed to occupy a period of several thousand years; when by long penance and many lives of virtue, it had finally freed itself from the last taint of vice, they believed the soul to be restored to its original perfection and happiness, and losing its individual existence, to become once more a part of the Divine substance.

This splendid system of myths which prevailed so generally throughout the East, and which subsequently passed, with but slight alterations, into the south of Europe, seems to have extended its influence to nearly all the nations of antiquity. Traces of it are said to have existed among the Celtic tribes of western Europe, as well as among the more rude and barbarous people inhabiting the north of that continent. At a later period, some of its doctrines found their way into the Rabbinical writings, and even mingled themselves with the purer faith of one at least of the Christian sects. It is not a little remarkable, that a mere fiction of the imagination, without the slightest foundation in either reason or analogy, should have continued for so many ages, to stir the strongest hopes and fears of such multitudes of our race.

But while the greater part of the philosophers, poets and sages of antiquity, were led from their exalted ideas of the human soul, to ascribe to it a divine nature and origin, there were some on the contrary, who regarding chiefly the mysterious and intimate relations which it holds to the body, believed it to be material in its essence, and to have sprung from no higher source than the corporeal frame, with which it is so closely connected. Reasoning from the remarkable changes which they observed matter to undergo in becoming a part of the living organization; the new powers and properties which it assumes, differing so widely, in many instances, from those previously possessed by it, this latter class drew the conclusion, that the same elements, aggregated in more complex forms, and united by subtler combinations, might exhibit all the phenomena, usually ascribed to spirit.

"Eadem coelum, mare, terras, flumina, solem,
Constituunt; eadem fruges, arbusta, animantia:
Verum, aliis alioque modo conmixta, moventur.
Quin etiam passim nostris in versibus ipsis
Multa elementa vides, multis communia verbis;
Quom tamen inter se versus, ac verba, necesse est
Confiteare, et re, et sonitu distare sonanti:
Tantum elementa queunt, permutato ordine solo!
At, rerum quae sunt primordia, plura adhibere
Possunt, unde queant variae res quaeque creari."

Lucretius, De rerum Natura.

They denied altogether the existence of spirit, and saw in its sublimest manifestations, only material agencies: "Nihil esse omnino animum, et hoc esse nomen totum inane, frustraque animalia et animantes appellari; neque in homine inesse animum vel animam, nec in bestia; vimque omnem eam qua vel agamus quid vel sentiamus, in omnibus corporibus vivis aequabiliter esse fusam, nec separabilem a corpore esse; quippe quae nulla sit, nec sit quidquam nisi corpus unum et simplex, ita figuratum ut temperatione naturae vigeat et sentiat." In a word, they believed what was denominated the soul, to be only a certain part of the body, possessing the powers of reason, memory, and feeling, in consequence of its higher and more elaborate organization.

As this view of the constitution of spiritual beings proposes to rest upon a more philosophical basis, and has moreover found its advocates in all ages and among all nations, it may be worth while to consider it for a moment, and see how far it will bear a philosophical examination.

When we compare the known powers of matter with those which

are commonly referred to spirit, what first and principally strikes us is their entire dissimilarity. The former are made known to us through the senses. Their existence is demonstrated by signs which are visible and tangible; and in their last analysis, they are all resolvable into some one of the different forms of attraction and repulsion. The latter reveal themselves only to our consciousness. None of the phenomena to which they give rise address the senses; and upon being analyzed, they are found to consist of certain faculties, such as apprehension, memory and will, so wholly unlike the mere attractive and repulsive forces of matter, that no comparison can properly be instituted between them.

Now we say, it is unphilosophical to refer powers which have no resemblance, which bear no marks of any kind of relationship, to the same essence, unless indeed their connection with it can be demonstrated; and this in the present case, we presume, will not be pretended.

The relation between property and substance, as we understand it, is not an arbitrary one, dependent upon the simple will of Deity. It is a constitutional, and in that sense, necessary relation. The property belongs to the substance, depends upon it, grows out of it, derives its very existence from it. The connection between the two is essential, and therefore incapable of being dissolved. No power can separate them, nor can either undergo any change without a corresponding change in the other. Everything which God has made, is constituted with certain definite and unalterable properties. These properties, are not endowments arbitrarily conferred by an act subsequent to its creation, but are included in and make a part of that creation. They are inherent, and must therefore continue to belong to it; nor can any other properties belong to it until changed in its nature by the same power that originally formed it. From the essential and necessary relation between property and substance, we say then, it is unphilosophical to refer to the same essence, powers so entirely dissimilar, as those which are manifested by matter and by spirit.

But we need not confine ourselves to a mere ontological view of the question. We may look at it in the light of analogy. We may bring to bear upon it, what we have learned of the constitution of things in the world around us, and may see whether this tends to confirm our *a priori* conclusions. If we direct our attention to the ascertained and acknowledged phenomena of matter, we perceive among them a wide diversity of character; and if we trace these phenomena back to the sources from which they respectively spring, we find them to be connected with a large number of different elements or material principles. If we further examine these elements, we discover

in each one of them, a distinct and peculiar nature, distinct and peculiar properties. Each one of them has its own modes of action, and is governed by its own laws. The powers which belong to one, cannot be acquired by another. The phenomena which depend upon one, cannot be exhibited by another. Each has a definite sphere of action, and performs a definite part in carrying forward that sublime progression of physical changes which had its commencement at the beginning of the creation, and will terminate only with its final dissolution.

These elements, it is true, though governed and restricted, as we have said, in all their manifestations, are capable of uniting with one another, and of thus forming new bodies, which exhibit other and different powers, and from which are evolved other and different phenomena. But what is important to our purpose, the new powers exhibited and the new phenomena evolved, belong to the same order as those connected with the original atoms, and bear no resemblance whatever to even the humblest manifestations of spirit. The same is true of the most complex forms of matter which can be produced either by the combination of the elements, or by the union with one another of substances already compounded. In no single instance do they make the smallest approach to sensibility or volition; powers which are universally found in beings possessing the feeblest spiritual endowments. Even the organic combinations of matter, which make up the several parts of living animals, and which have been supposed to furnish the materialist with his strongest arguments, in reality afford no support to his doctrine. The powers exhibited by these, though further removed from the mere elementary properties of matter, are still of the same order. In the most subtle processes of life we recognize only physical agencies, we observe only material phenomena. That which chiefly distinguishes the changes elaborated within the structure of vegetables and animals, is the union of complexity with regularity. The several parts of the structure, which is itself complex, are so formed, and are placed in such relations, as to cause the same processes to be continually repeated, until they are at length interrupted by some accident, or else brought to a termination, by the deranged and impaired condition of the organs upon which they depend. Each animal and each vegetable is in this way a little world within itself, embracing in its organization, all the provisions necessary for maintaining its cycles of phenomena during the period of its destined existence.

But it deserves here to be especially remarked in connection with our argument, that for the establishment and maintenance of these various processes of the living economy, other agents are employed be-

sides the different forms of ordinary matter—agents of a higher nature, of a more subtle essence, destitute of all the grosser and more sensible properties of matter—agents, which have no weight, which traverse without obstacle the densest bodies, and which move through space with a velocity of which the human mind in vain attempts to form any adequate conception. We refer to heat, light and electricity. These agents, whether to be regarded as three distinct principles, or, as many facts seem to indicate, only different modifications of the same power, are everywhere associated with matter, and are more or less intimately concerned in the production of all its phenomena. Especially is their agency important in the vital phenomena. The innumerable changes which are continually occurring within the structure of every living, organized being, all take place, if not through their instrumentality, at least under their direction and influence. No one of the functions of either animals or vegetables could be performed for a single moment without their assistance. Nay, further, withdraw from matter generally, the quickening and transforming influence of these wonderful agents, and all nature would be deprived of life and motion and beauty. The planetary spheres, it is true, might continue to revolve about their central orbs, but it would be in the black vestments of impenetrable, changeless night; it would be in the fearful chill and motionless rigidity of eternal frost; it would be in the unbroken silence and solitude of universal death.

If powers of a higher order than those which belong to simple matter are necessary, not only for developing and maintaining the various forms of organic life, but also for carrying forward the inorganic changes of the external world; and if these powers can be traced to a connection with agents more subtile in their nature than the material elements; then it is only reasoning from analogy to conclude that the incomparably higher powers of mind, cannot have a material origin, cannot arise from any combinations, however complex, of gross, inert matter; it is but reasoning from analogy, we say, to infer that thought, feeling and affection must be the attributes of a still more subtile and refined essence, which, by way of distinction, we call spirit. Any conclusion, short of this, would be no less at variance with the fair deductions from what we have learned of our own constitution, and that of the beings and things around us, than it would be inconsistent with that fundamental principle of belief, which leads us to refer every manifestation of power to a cause, substance or essence adequate in its nature to produce it.

There is another theory of the human soul of an intermediate character—a sort of compromise, between the two already considered,

which has found many and able advocates in the schools of modern Germany, and which, in the system of the eloquent Cousin, has been supposed to solve the problems of creation and the universe, by making the absolute and the infinite, objects of positive knowledge. According to this theory, the powers revealed in consciousness are to be referred to two distinct natures; the one, created, finite, individual, and the other, uncreated, infinite, universal. The sensations, ideas and impressions received through the medium of the senses, are regarded as belonging to the individual nature, they being in their character subjective, and having no necessary or perceivable relation to anything without the mind itself. The ideas derived from the reason, on the contrary, including all those suggestions and intuitions which have respect to external existences, whether considered by themselves or in their relations to one another and to the percipient being, are believed to be objective and impersonal; and though manifesting themselves in the individual, are supposed to have their origin in a higher source—to be, in fact, revelations of the pure, eternal, Divine reason. They mingle with the other facts of consciousness, and throw light upon them. They appear in, and govern humanity, but are not a part of it. They are a manifestation of the infinite and absolute intelligence, and a "true revelation of the divine in the human."

This doctrine of the two-fold nature of the human soul is made to rest on the testimony of consciousness. The sensible phenomena, it is said, all manifest themselves as so many states, conditions or affections of the sentient being. Though produced by outward causes, they convey no intimation of these causes; nor would they alone awaken the slightest idea of the existence of anything whatever, beyond themselves. The rational phenomena, on the other hand, it is said, make themselves known in their spontaneous and unreflected condition, as impersonal and objective, as wholly independent of the being in whom they are manifested, so that they would continue to be the same, although that being were annihilated. This absolute character of the ideas of the reason can be recognized only by penetrating into the depths of consciousness, and there "beneath the apparently relative and subjective character of the necessary principles of intelligence," catching the spontaneous suggestions and intuitions as they first appear, before they have been acted upon by the will, or have become mixed and blended with the ideas derived through the senses.

In reviewing this doctrine of the union of two natures in the spiritual constitution of man, two objections, we think, naturally suggest themselves.

In the first place, of which of these natures, we would ask, is consciousness an attribute? of the rational or the sensible? If of the former, how is it able to recognize the states of the latter? or if of the latter, how can it take cognizance of the states of the former? For although a being may perceive that which is external to its own existence, it can be conscious only of what passes within itself. It is necessary then to suppose the two natures, the finite and the infinite, the human and the divine, to be united in such a manner as to form but one individual, endowed with a faculty of consciousness, commensurate with its entire being—a supposition involving that which is altogether incomprehensible—which, if taught by revelation, might indeed be received as an article of religious belief, but which, without such evidence, cannot be made the basis of a philosophical system.

In the second place, we doubt the reality of the distinction between the sensible and the rational phenomena, in respect to their subjective character. Perception is as much a state or condition of the individual as sensation. The most subtle cognitions of the reason—the intuitive apprehensions of the relations of quantity and of numbers, of the relation between effect and cause, property and substance, the finite and the infinite, God and the universe—what are they but so many states or acts of the same individual? They differ from the various forms of sensation, inasmuch as the latter terminate in themselves, while the former go out to the objects and relations of whose existence they assure us. But both are alike modifications, and only modifications of ourselves. Nor can we get beyond ourselves, except on the principle of faith. The only rational ground for placing confidence in any of our varied perceptions is the veracity of God—the assurance that he has so made us, that when we rightly employ our several faculties, they will impart to us true knowledge—right conceptions of himself, and of the universe which he has created. Beyond this, we cannot go, for it is obvious that we might have been constituted in such a manner that all our senses should be but the avenues of illusion and falsehood. That we are not so made, we must take upon trust. Philosophy and religion, our knowledge of the material and of the spiritual, of this world and of the world to come, are found in the last analysis to rest upon the same basis, and must be alike received in the spirit of faith—of faith in the goodness and truth of Him who hath made us and revealed himself to us.

For any just idea of the nature of the human soul, and of spiritual beings generally, we must look to a different source from consciousness. This, at most, can only make known their states, their acts, their condition. It touches not their essence. It throws no

light upon their constitution. Whatever knowledge we may gain of this, must be derived from the teachings of analogy—not that analogy which is dependent upon a supposed resemblance between matter and spirit, but that higher analogy which has its foundation in the common relation which matter and spirit alike sustain to God—an analogy, the extent and force and fulness of which, has not commonly, we think, been sufficiently considered. Although so widely removed from one another in essence and in properties, both these forms of being originated in conceptions of the same mind, and were formed by the same hand. Both were, moreover, created not as ultimate in themselves, but only as means for the attainment of ends. And in the employment of both for the respective purposes intended to be accomplished by them, we observe the same unity of principle and plan, and the same variety of results. Hence it is reasonable to infer that in the case of both, the same method has been adopted for evolving this variety in unity—for building upon the same type, so many and so different forms, for developing through the same agent, so many and so different powers.

This inference is, moreover, greatly strengthened by the fact, that throughout the physical universe, in the production of its least and most insignificant, as well as its sublimest phenomena, the mode or principle of procedure is always and everywhere the same. We recognize it alike in the mineral, which is formed within the earth, in the plant which grows upon its surface, in the simple structure of the minute and humble infusoria, and in the elaborate organization of man, the head of the animal creation, in the scarcely discernible mote which floats in the sunbeam, and the mighty spheres which weave their mystic dance through the limitless fields of space. It is the principle of combination, association, aggregation. It is the grouping, the bringing into relation to one another of a few simple elements, constituted each with certain definite properties, so that by virtue of these properties, they shall spontaneously work out all the different results intended to be accomplished.

Such being the procedure of the Divine being in evolving the productions of the material world, what supposition is so probable as that of like procedure in the spiritual world? Such being the method adopted for the accomplishment of the Divine purposes in all those parts of the universe which come under our observation, and which we have faculties to investigate, the fair inference, we may almost say from experience, certainly from analogy is, that a like method has been adopted in those other parts, which lie without the sphere of our observation, and which we have no faculties for directly investigating.

Accordingly, on the ground thus presented, we shall assume the existence of spiritual elements, and shall suppose the spiritual part of the different races of beings inhabiting our globe, from man downwards, to be constituted from these elements, in a manner analogous to that in which their bodily organizations are formed from the material atoms. Adopting this hypothesis as the only one suggested by analogy, the only one which we have any data whatever for forming, we shall proceed to inquire, whether the spiritual phenomena presented by the several orders of the animal creation, correspond to it. And if we mistake not, we shall find upon examination, that they are not only in perfect harmony with it, but in numerous instances receive from it an explanation, such as they derive from none of the suppositions more commonly entertained upon the subject.

Commencing with the lowest division of the animal kingdom, we find here beings of the most simple character, presenting in their structure scarcely any distinction of parts or organs, but having all the functions essential to life equally and indiscriminately performed throughout their entire substance. And what is truly remarkable, if we take one of these little animals and cut it into several parts, each part including within itself all the powers necessary to continued nutrition and growth, soon becomes a separate and distinct animal in all respects as perfect as that from which it was taken. That the original animal was endowed with a spiritual nature, however limited and humble, we know from the powers of sensation and volition exhibited by it. Wherever these attributes are manifested, they afford evidence of something beyond and above matter. Nay, between these and the properties of the most complex forms of matter, there is a mighty chasm, which no analogies even enable us to bridge over. While, on the other hand, these attributes and the highest powers of human intelligence, although apparently so unlike, yet as we see them displayed by the different tribes of the animal creation, pass into one another by gradations which are scarcely perceptible. But this spiritual nature, or rather the essence or principle constituting it, must have undergone division along with the bodily organization with which it was connected, and through which it seems to have been uniformly diffused. It must, therefore, have been extended and composed of parts; and although these parts were connected in such a manner as to form but a single individual, the being so formed could not have possessed that simplicity of constitution, which is commonly ascribed to spiritual agents.

If we ascend in the scale of organic life, until we come to the division of articulated animals, we meet with beings less simple in their

structure, and presenting, especially in the connection between the spiritual and corporeal part of their natures, a very different type of character. Here we find specific organs appropriated to most of the different animal functions. We find a well developed nervous system, consisting of several distinct brains, situated at intervals along the body, with as many distinct sets of nerves both of sensation and of voluntary motion originating from them, and thence distributing themselves to the different parts of the entire animal. These several brains, or nervous centres, though separate from one another, are not in a state of isolation. On the contrary, they are traversed by a large, nervous cord, which chaining them together, establishes the most intimate relation between them. In this class of animals we find the powers of sense and will not generally diffused through their substance, but collected in these different brains, from which, through the medium of the nerves, they manifest themselves at the surface.

As an example of the type we are now considering, the common wasp may be taken. On separating the trunk from the abdomen, each part will be found to retain for a long time, both its sensibility and its power of motion. If the trunk be irritated, the legs and the wings will be put in motion, and it will obviously endeavor to escape from the cause of the irritation. If the abdomen be pressed, it will thrust out its sting with great vigor, and will direct it, at each renewed effort, as far as possible towards the point of annoyance. These struggles of the divided insect gradually decline in energy, until at length they cease altogether apparently from mere exhaustion, as neither of the dissevered parts contains all the organs necessary for continued nutrition. Here, again, we have the remarkable phenomenon of the division of a living, voluntary agent—a phenomenon readily explained, indeed, if we suppose such agents to be extended and to have parts, but wholly inexplicable on the supposition of their constitutional unity.

In man, and in vertebrated animals generally, sensation and volition, like all the other functions of life, are still further centralized. Here we find but one brain, one common centre of the whole nervous system. With this, the spirit has its immediate connection; from this, all the volitions emanate, and to this, all the sensations are referred. Paralyze this, and the powers of feeling and of action are alike suspended.

The nervous system, including the brain as its centre, is the constituted medium of intercourse between the mind and the body. It is only through this, that either holds any relation to the other, or can in any manner affect the other. All the communications of the will are

transmitted along it; all the impressions of sense are conveyed through it. Each nerve, joining in the brain upon spirit, and resting at its outward extremity upon matter, spans the gulf, which lies between these two so widely removed forms of being. Detach it from either of its connections, or interrupt at any point its continuity, and their isolation is complete. Could we look into the nervous system and understand fully its structure, could we learn the properties by which it holds relation on the one hand to the spiritual, and on the other to the material, and ascertain by what means the communications, whether of sense or of will, are transmitted along its innumerable channels, there would undoubtedly be revealed to us, a far more complex mechanism—involving, it is probable, new powers and new forms of contrivance—than we discover in any other part of the animal frame. There would also be a light thrown upon the constitution of spiritual beings, such as we cannot hope for, from the comparatively dim and uncertain reflections of material analogies.

The powers of the living agent, as well as the system of nerves through which they are manifested, being thus centralized in man and in all the higher animals, we should not expect to meet here with the phenomena of division observed in the humbler races. Still, however, if we attentively consider the instrumentalities employed in sensation and in volition, we can scarcely avoid the inference that even here the living agent is more or less extended, and if so, then there can be little doubt, from the analogy of the lower tribes, that it is also made up of parts.

Nerves, appropriated to conveying ideas and sensations to the mind, originate in all parts of the body, but more especially at its surface, and collected into separate and distinct bundles, go either directly or through the medium of the spinal marrow to the brain, where they are brought into direct relation to the spirit. Each one of these nerves, in order that the action which takes place along it, whatever that action be, may not pass to those adjacent, and thus give rise to confusion in our sensations, is insulated throughout its entire course. Preserved thus distinct in their progress towards the brain, these different nerves must arrive there at as many different points, and at as many different points act either mediately or immediately upon the spirit. How, we would ask, can the spirit be thus acted upon, if it have not extension?

The inference is equally strong from the nerves of voluntary motion. These originating in the brain, pass out of that organ and go either directly, or through the medium of the spinal marrow, to be distributed among the muscles. Like the nerves of sensation, they are

kept distinct from one another throughout their whole course, and as they are exceedingly numerous, they must commence in the brain, at a great number of different points, and must consequently be acted upon by the mind at as many different points in the transmission of its volitions to the several parts of the body. How can this be, unless the mind have extension? In a word, if the mind be not extended, how can it act upon an extended organ, or how can an extended organ act upon it?

There are one or two other points of view from which we would glance at our subject before dismissing it.

If we deny to spiritual beings a compound nature or essence, and maintain the doctrine of their absolute simplicity, it becomes necessary to suppose as many specific creations as there are, or have been, such beings. Every individual human soul, the spirit or living principle of each one of the countless tribes of animals, from man down to the humblest thing that lives and breathes, must be the work of a special act of the creative power. Nay, further, as these beings shall continue to make their appearance in our world, each one of the innumerable multitude, with all its individual peculiarities, must come directly from the hand of the Creator. Few, we apprehend, will be prepared to admit this necessary consequence of the doctrine of the simplicity or oneness of living agents. On the other hand, adopt the hypothesis for which we contend, and all is plain, simple, natural. Instead of being immediately created, these agents are formed out of materials which previously existed. They come into being, under the influence of spiritual laws which determine their character, in the same manner as the material laws determine that of the bodily organization associated with them. And as the mental endowments and the corporeal faculties are in all cases precisely adapted to one another, there is probably some hidden tie or relationship existing between the spiritual and the material, by which such adaptation is secured.

This hypothesis, also, enables us to account for the hereditary transmission of mental as well as bodily peculiarities. Many of these are too deeply seated in the spirit—too closely connected with the conscience and will and affections to be explained from any imagined influence of the material organization. They can be satisfactorily accounted for, only on the supposition of laws of descent, which extend their influence over both the mind and the body, and mould alike the character of each.

This hypothesis serves further to explain the great changes which the mind undergoes—the remarkable enlargement which takes place

in all its powers and faculties in passing from the feeble condition of infancy to the strength and vigor of manhood. As in the analogous case of the body, the same laws which determine its original formation, provide for its subsequent development and growth. We know it is usual to regard the soul—the living principle within—as the same in essence, at all the different periods of its existence, and to refer the varying manifestations of its powers to alterations in the organic medium, through which they are exhibited. But the explanation, as we think all must allow, is far from being satisfactory. Unless we ascribe to the brain an office in the evolution of the mental phenomena beyond that of a medium or instrument, no changes in it can sufficiently account for the gradual expansion and unfolding of those spiritual powers which are revealed only in the intimacy of consciousness. Any explanation of these, derived from that organ, will be found upon examination, to make it in reality, not the instrument of the living powers, but their seat and their source, and thus to resolve itself into the doctrine of materialism.

The same hypothesis accounts equally for those minor changes which take place in the character and powers of human beings, and also, though to a much smaller extent, of many of the animals, from the influence of culture and habit. The fact is one with which we are so familiar, and which appears to us so natural and simple, that it would seem at first view not to require an explanation. But it must be remembered that alteration of properties implies alteration of substance. Wherever there is change in character, there must be a corresponding change in that to which the character belongs. Wherever there is change in powers, there must be a corresponding change in that which is the seat of those powers. And how in the case of living agents, can these changes be accounted for, on the supposition of their oneness or simplicity?

The view which we have thus presented of the constitution of spiritual beings, when applied to the human soul, may appear unfriendly to a belief in its endless duration—may seem rather to favor that of its being formed only for a temporary existence, and destined at last, like the body, to undergo dissolution. We think, however, it is not so. We believe that no sound argument for the future life of man, will lose anything of its force, from the admission of our doctrine. Nothing seems to us more clear than that we cannot legitimately infer from the nature of the human soul or of any other created being or thing—its immortality. Arguments drawn from this source, as well as those derived from the exalted powers of the spirit and its longings after a higher and better life, however they may serve the purposes

of declamation, take no hold upon the reason—fasten no convictions in the understanding. Affecting only the imagination and desires, they leave the mind in a state similar to that described by Cicero in his Tusculan Quaestions, as produced by the reading of the Phaedo of Plato: "Nescio quo modo, dum lego, assentior; cum posui librum, et mecum ipse de immortalitate, animorum coepi cogitare, assensio omnis illa elabitur."

Whether the spiritual part of man be destined to survive death, and to live on forever, is not a question of philosophy, but simply one of fact, and one too of this peculiar character, that it is dependent solely upon the will of the Deity. It is obvious, therefore, that all our knowledge in respect to it must come from Him. He alone has formed us, and He alone can know his purposes concerning us. So far as it hath pleased Him to reveal them, whether through the teachings of inspiration or the intuitions of our own moral natures, and so far as we are able to gather them from what is discernible of the divine plan in the constitution and government of the world around us, so far we may advance in solving the question in which all have so deep an interest, and which in all ages has been the great problem of our race—but no further. We will not, however, extend these remarks upon a theme which has only an incidental connection with the subject of our essay. We may, possibly, resume it on some future occasion, and give to it a consideration more in proportion to its importance.

ARTICLE IV.

THE RELATION OF LANGUAGE TO THOUGHT.

By W. G. T. Shedd, Professor of English Literature, University of Vermont.

"It is a truth," (says Hartung in beginning his subtile and profound work on the Greek Particles,) "as simple as it is fruitful, that language is no arbitrary, artificial, and gradual invention of the reflective understanding, but a necessary and organic product of human nature, appearing contemporaneously with the activity of thought. Speech is the correlate of thought; both require and condition each other like body and soul, and are developed at the same time and in the same degree, both in the case of the individual and the nation. Words are the coinage of conceptions, freeing themselves from the

dark chaos of intimations and feelings, and gaining shape and clearness. In so far as a man uses and is master of language, has he also attained clearness of thought: the developed and spoken language of a people is its expressed intelligence."[1]

In this extract it is asserted that language is an *organic* product of which thought is the organizing and vitalizing principle. Writers upon language have generally acknowledged a connection of some sort between thought and language, but they have not been unanimous with respect to the nature of the connection. The common assertions that language is the "dress" of thought—is the "vehicle" of thought—point to an outward and mechanical connection between the two: while the fine remark of Wordsworth that "language is not so much the dress of thought as its incarnation," and the frequent comparison of the relation which they bear to each other, with that which exists between the body and the soul, indicate that a *vital* connection is believed to exist between language and thought.

The correctness of this latter doctrine becomes apparent when it is considered that everything growing out of human nature, in the process of its development and meeting its felt wants, is of necessity *living* in its essence, and cannot be regarded as a dead mechanical contrivance.

That language has such a natural and spontaneous origin is evident from the fact, that history gives no account of any language which was the direct invention of any one man or set of men to supply the wants of a nation utterly destitute of the ability to *express* its thought. Individuals have bestowed an alphabet, a written code of laws, useful mechanical inventions upon their countrymen, but no individual ever bestowed a language. This has its origin in human nature, or rather in that constitutional necessity, under which human nature in common with all creation is placed by Him who sees the end from the beginning, which compels the invisible to become visible; the formless to take form; the intelligible to corporealize itself. That thought is invisible and spiritual in essence, is granted by all systems of philosophy except the coarsest and most unphilosophic materialism. It is therefore subject to the universal law, and *must* become sensuous—must be *communicated.*

In the case of the primitive language, spoken by the first human pair, we must conceive of it as a *gift* from the Creator, perfectly correspondent, like all their other endowments, to the wants of a *living soul.* As in this first instance the bodily form reached its height of being and of beauty, not through the ordinary processes of generation,

[1] Partikeln Lehre, Bd. I. §§ 1, 2.

birth and growth, but as an instantaneous creation; so too the form of thought, language, passed through no stages of development (as some teach) from the inarticulate cry of the brute, to the articulate and intelligent tones of cultivated man, but came into full and finished existence simultaneously with the fiat that called the full-formed soul and body into being. It would not have been a perfect creation, had the first man stood mute in mature manhood, and that too in his unfallen state and amidst the beauty and glory of Eden!

As the posterity of the first man come into existence by a process, and as both soul and body in their case undergo development before reaching the points of bloom and maturity, language also in their case is a slow and gradual formation. It begins with the dawn of reflective consciousness, and unfolds itself as this becomes deeper and clearer. In the infancy of a nation it is exquisitely fitted for the lyrical expression of those thoughts and feelings which rise simple and sincere in the national mind and heart, before philosophical reflection has rendered them complex, or advancing civilization has dried up their freshness. As the period of fancy and feeling passes by and that of reason and reflection comes in, language becomes more rigid and precise in its structure, conforms itself to the expression of profound thought, and history and philosophy take the place of the ballad and the chronicle.

Now the point to be observed here is, that this whole process is spontaneous and natural; is a growth and not a manufacture. Thought embodies itself, even as the merely animal life becomes sensuous and sensible through its own tendency and activity. When investigating language, therefore, we are really within the sphere of life and living organization, and to attempt its comprehension by means of mechanical principles would be as absurd as to attempt to apprehend the phenomena of the animal kingdom by the principles that regulate the investigation of inorganic nature. It is only by the application of dynamical principles, of the doctrines of life, that we can get a true view of language or be enabled to use it with power.

It is assumed then that thought is the life of language; and this too in no figurative sense of the word, but in its strict scientific signification as denoting the principle that organizes and vivifies the form in which it makes its appearance. It is assumed that thought is as really the living principle of language as the soul is the life of the body, and the assumption verifies itself by the clearness which it introduces into the investigation of the subject and by the light which it flares into its darker and more mysterious parts. That *fusion*, for instance, of the thoughts with the words which renders the discourse of the poet

glowing and tremulous with feeling and life, can be explained upon no other supposition than that the immaterial entity born of beauty in the poet's mind actually materializes itself, and thus enlivens the otherwise lifeless syllables. Nothing but a *vital* connection with the thoughts that breathe, can account for the words that burn.

We are not therefore to look upon language as having intrinsic existence, separate from the thought which it conveys, but as being external thought—expressed thought. Words were not first invented, and then assigned to conceptions as their arbitrary, and intrinsically, meaningless signs ; mere indices, having no more inward connection with the things indicated, than the algebraic marks, + and —, have with the notions of increase and diminution. In the order of nature, language follows,rather than precedes thought, and is subject to all its modifications from its first rise in the consciousness of the individual and the nation, up to that of the philosopher and the philosophic age in a nation's history. Language in essence is thought, is thought in an outward form, and consequently cannot exist, or be the object of reflection dissevered from the vital principle which substantiates it. The words of the most thoughtless man do nevertheless contain some meaning, and words have effect upon us only in proportion as they are filled with thought.

And this fulness must not be conceived of as flowing into empty moulds already prepared. It is a statement of one of the most profound investigators of physical life, that the living power merely added to the dead organ is not life ;[1] i. e. that no intensity whatever of physical life streamed upon and through a dead hand lying upon a dissecting table can produce life in the form of the living member. The living member cannot come into existence except as growing out of a living body, and the living body cannot come into existence unless life, the immaterial and invisible, harden into the materiality and burst into the visibility of a minute seminal point which teems and swells with the whole future organism ; a point or dot of life from which as a centre, the radiation, the organization, and the circulation may commence. In like manner it is impossible, if it were conceivable, to produce human language by the superinduction of thought upon, or by the assignation of meaning to, a mass of unmeaning sounds already in existence. When a conception comes into the consciousness of one mind and seeks expression that it may enter the consciousness of another mind, it must be conceived of as uttering itself in a word, which

[1] Carus' Physiologie, Bd. 1. Vorrede. He denies the correctness of the following formula upon which, he affirms, the mechanical school of physiologists proceeds: —todtes Organ + Kraft = Leben.

is not taken at hap-hazard and which might have been any other arbitrary sound, but which is *prompted* and *formed* by the creative thought struggling out of the world of mind, and making use of the vocal organs in order to enter the world of sense.

We cannot, it is true, verify all this by reference to all the words we are in the habit of using every day, because we are too far off from the period of their origin, and because they are oftentimes combinations of simple sounds that were originally formed by vocal organs differing from our own by marked peculiarities, yet the simplicity and naturalness of the Greek of Homer, or the English of Chaucer, which is no other than the affinity of the language with the thought, the sympathy of the sound with the sense, cause us to *feel* what in the present state of philology most certainly cannot be proved in the case of every single word, that primarily, in the root and heart, language is self-embodied thought.

Yet though it is impossible at present in the case of every single word to verify the assumption upon which we have gone, it is not difficult to do this in the case of that portion of the language in which there is emphasis and intensity of meaning. The verb, by which action and suffering (which in the animal world is but a calmer and more intense activity) are expressed, is a word often and evidently suited to the thought. Those nouns which are names not of things but of acts and energies, are likewise exceedingly significant of the things signified. The motions of the mouth, the position of the organs, and the tension of the muscles of speech in the utterance of such words as shock, smite, writhe, slake, quench, are produced by the force and energy and character of the conceptions which these words communicate, just as the prolonged relaxation of the organs and muscles in the pronunciation of soothe, breathe, dream, calm, and the like, results naturally from the nature of the thought of which they are the vocal embodiment.

And this leads us to notice that this view of the origin and nature of language acquires additional support from considering that the vocal sound is the product of physical organs which are started into action and directed in their motion by the soul itself.[1] Even the tones of the animal are suited to the inward feeling by the particular play of muscles and organs of utterance. The feeling of pleasure *could* not, so long as nature is herself, twist these muscles and organs into the emission of the sharp scream of physical agony, any more than it could light up the eye with the glare and flash of rage.

[1] See on this point Wallis's English Grammar, and Hearne's Langtofts Chronicle, Vol. I. Preface.

Now if this is true in the low sphere of animal existence, it is still more true in the sphere of intellectual and moral existence. If life is true to itself in the lower, it is true to itself in the higher realm of its manifestation. When full of earnest thought and feeling the mind *uses* the body at will, and the latter naturally and spontaneously subserves the former. As thought becomes more and more earnest, and feeling more and more glowing, the body bends and yields with increasing pliancy, down to its minutest fibres and most delicate tissues; to the working of the engaged mind, the organs of speech become one with the soul, and are swayed and wielded by it. The word is, as it were, *put into the mouth*, by the vehement and excited spirit.

> When the mind is quickened, out of doubt,
> The organs, though defunct and dead before,
> Break up their drowsy grave and newly move
> With casted slough and fresh legerity.[1]

As well might it be said that there is no vital and natural connection between the feeling and the blush in which it mantles, or the tear in which it finds vent, as that the word—the "*winged* word"—has only an arbitrary and dead relation to the thought.

Again, it is generally conceded that there is an inherent fitness of gesture, attitude and look, to the thought or feeling conveyed by them; but do attitude, gesture, and look sustain a more intimate relation to thought and feeling than language does; language, at once the most universal as well as most particular in its application, the most exhaustive and perfect, of all the media of communication between mind and mind, between heart and heart? The truth is, that *all* the media through which thought becomes sensuous and communicable are in greater or less degree, yet in *some* degree, *homogeneous and connatural with thought itself.* In other words they all, in a greater or less degree, possess manifest propriety.

It is to be borne in mind here, that the question is not whether thought could not have embodied itself in other forms than it has, whether other languages could not have arisen, but whether the existing forms possess adaptedness to the thought they convey. Life is not compelled to manifest itself in one only form, or in one particular set of forms, in any of the kingdoms, but it *is* compelled to make the form in which it does appear, vital like itself. The forms, for aught that we know, may be infinite in number, in which the invisible principle may become sensible, but the *corpse* is no one of them.

Thought as the substance of discourse is logical, necessary and immutable in its nature, while language as the form is variable. The

[1] Henry V. Act. IV. Sc. 1.

language of a people is continually undergoing a change, so that those who speak it in its later periods, (it very often happens,) would be unintelligible to those who spoke it in its earlier ages. Chaucer cannot be read by Englishmen of the present day without a glossary.[1] Again, the languages of different nations differ from each other. There is great variety in the changes of the verb to express the passive form. The subject is sometimes included in the verb, sometimes is prefixed, and sometimes is suffixed to it. The Malay language assumes the plural instead of the singular as the basis of number, all nouns primarily denoting the plural. Some use the dual and some do not; some give gender and number to adjectives, and others do not; some have the article and some have not. And yet all these different languages are equally embodiments of thought and of the same thought substantially. For the human mind is everywhere, and at all times, subject to the invariable laws of its own constitution, and that logical, immutable truth which stands over against it as its correlative object, is developed in much the same way among all nations in whom the intellect obtains a development. The vital principle—logical, immutable truth in the form of human thought—is here seen embodying itself in manifold forms with freedom and originality, and with an expressive suitableness in every instance.

That a foreign language does not seem expressive to the stranger is no argument against the fundamental hypothesis. It is expressive to the native-born, and becomes so to the stranger in proportion as he acquires (not a mere mechanical and book knowledge, but) a vital and vernacular knowledge of it. And this expressiveness is not the result of custom. Apart from the instinctive association of a certain word with a certain conception, there is an instinctive sense of its intrinsic fitness to communicate the thought intended—of its expressiveness. For why should some words be *more* expressive than others, if they all equally depend upon the law of association for their significance? And why is a certain portion of every language more positive, emphatic, and intense than the remaining portions? There is in every language a class of words which are its life and life-blood, a class to which the mind in its fervor and glow *instinctively* betakes itself in order to free itself of its thoughts in the most effective and satisfactory manner. But this is irreconcilable with the hypothesis that all words are but lifeless signs, acquiring their signification and *apparent* suit-

[1] Yet even in this case, as Wordsworth truly remarks, "the *affecting* parts are almost always expressed in language pure, and universally intelligible even to this day."—*Preface to Lyrical Ballads.* The more *intense* and *vital* the thought, the nearer the form approaches the essence, the more universal does it become.

ableness from use and custom, and all consequently being upon the same dead level with respect to expressiveness.

Still another proof that the connection between language and thought is organic, is found in the fact that the relation between the two is evidently that of action and reaction.

We have seen that language is the produce of thought; but this is not to be understood as though language were a mere *effect*, of which thought is the mere *cause*. The mere effect cannot *react* upon the pure cause. It is thrown off and away from its cause (as the cannon ball is from the cannon), so that there it stands insulated and independent with respect to its origin.

This is not the case with language. Originated by thought, and undergoing modifications as thought is developed, it, in turn, exerts a reflex influence upon its originating cause. In proportion as language is an exact and sincere expression, does thought itself become exact and sincere. The more appropriate and expressive the language, the more correct will be the thought and the more expressive and powerful will be the direction which thought takes.

But if language were a mechanical invention, no such reaction as this could take place upon the inventor. While connected with thought only by an arbitrary compact on the part of those who made use of it, it would be *separated* from thought by origin and by nature. Not being a living and organic product, it could sustain to thought only the external and lifeless relation of cause and effect, and consequently would remain one and the same amid all the life, motion, and modification which the immaterial principle might undergo.

Of course if such were the relation between the two, it would be impossible to account for all that unconscious but real *change* ever going on in a spoken language, which we call *growth* and *progress*. Language upon such an hypothesis would remain stationary in substance, and at best could be altered only by aggregation from without. New words might be invented and added to the number already in existence, but no change could occur in the spirit of the language, if it may be allowed to speak of spirit in such a connection.

Furthermore, if there is no vital relation between language and thought, it would be absurd to speak of the beneficial influence upon mental development (which is but the development of thought) of the study of philology. If in strict literality the relation of language to thought is that of the invention to the mind of the inventor, then the study of this outward, and in itself lifeless instrument, would be of no worth in developing an essence so intensely vital, so full of motion,

and with such an irrepressible tendency to development as the human mind.

It is however a truth and a fact that the study of a well organized language is one of the very best means of mental education. It brings the mind of the student into communication with the whole mind of a nation, and infuses into his culture the good and bad elements—the whole genius and spirit of the people of whose mind it is the evolution. In no way can the mind of the individual be made to feel the power and influence of the mind of the race, and thereby receive the greatest possible enlargement and liberalizing, so well as by the philosophic study of language. A rational method of education makes use of this study as an indispensable discipline, and selects for this purpose two languages distinguished for the intimate relation which they sustain to the particular forms of thought they respectively express. For the Greek language is so fused and one with Grecian thought, that it is living to this day, and has been the source of life to literature ever since its revival in the fifteenth century; and the rigid but majestic Latin is the exact embodiment of the organizing and imperial ideas of Rome.

These languages exhibit the changes of thought in the Greek and Roman mind. They take their form and derive their spirit from the peculiarities of these nations. Hence the strong and original influence which they exert upon the modern mind. If these languages really contained no tincture of the intellect that made them and made use of them, if they communicated none of the spirit of antiquity, they would indeed be "dead" languages for all purposes of mental enlivening and development.

But it is not so. The Greek and Roman mind with all that passed through it, whether it were thought or feeling, whether it were individual or national, instead of remaining in the sphere of consciousness merely, and thus being kept from the ken of all after ages, projected itself, as it were, into these fine languages, into these noble forms, and not only became a κτῆμα ἐς ἀεί for mankind, but also a possession with whose characteristics the possessor is in sympathy, and from which he derives intellectual nourishment and strength.

A further proof that language has a living connection with thought, is found in the fact that feeling and passion suggest language.

Feeling and passion are the most vital of all the activities of the human soul, flowing as they do from the heart, and that which is prompted by them may safely be affirmed to have life. That words the most expressive and powerful fly from the lips of the impassioned thinker is notorious. The man who is naturally of few words, be-

comes both fluent and appropriate in the use of language when his mind glows with his subject and feeling is awakened.

But the use of language is the same in kind and character with its origin. The processes through which language passes from the beginning to the end of its existence are all of the same nature. As in the wide sphere of the universe, preservation is a constant creation, and the things that are, are sustained and perpetuated on principles in accordance with the character impressed upon them by the creative fiat, so in all the narrower spheres of the finite, the use and development are coincident and harmonious with the origin and nature. We may therefore argue back from the use and development to the origin and nature; and when we find that in all periods of its history human language is suggested, and that too in its most expressive form, by feeling and passion, we may infer that these had to do in its origin, and have left something of themselves in its nature. For how could there be a point and surface of communication between words and feeling, so that the latter should start out the former in all the freshness of a new creation, if there were no *interior* connection between them. For language as it falls from the lips of passion is tremulous with life—with the life of the soul, and imparts the life of the soul to all who hear it.

If, then, in the actual every-day use of language, we find it to be suggested by passion, and to be undergoing changes both in form and signification, without the intervention of a formal compact on the part of men, it is just to infer that no such compact called it into existence. If, upon watching the progress and growth of a language, we find it in continual flux and reflux, and detect everywhere in it, change and motion, without any consciously directed effort to this end on the part of those who speak it, it is safe to infer that the same unconscious spontaneousness characterized it in its beginning. Moreover, if in every-day life we unconsciously, yet really, use language not as a lifeless sign of our thought, but believe that in employing it we are really expressing our mind, and furthermore, if we never in any way agreed to use the tongue which we drank in with our mother's milk, but were born into it and grew up into its use, even as we were born into and grew up under the intellectual and moral constitution imposed upon human nature by its Creator, we may safely conclude that language, too, is a provision on the part of the author of our being, and consequently is organic and alive.

Indeed, necessity of speech, like necessity of religion and government and social existence, is laid upon man by his constitution, and as in these latter instances whatever secondary arrangements may be

made by circumstances, the primary basis and central form is fixed in human nature, so in the case of language, whatever may be the secondary modifications growing out of national differences and peculiarities of vocal organs, the deep ground and source of language is the human constitution itself.

Frederick Schlegel, after quoting Schiller's lines:

> Thy knowledge, thou sharest with superior spirits;
> Art, oh man! thou hast alone,

calls language "the general, all-embracing *art* of man." This is truth. For language is embodiment—the embodiment not indeed of one particular idea in a material form, but of thought at large, in an immaterial yet sensible form. And the fact that the material used is sound —the most ethereal of media—imparts to this "all embracing art" a spirituality of character that raises it above many of the fine arts, strictly so called. It is an embodiment of the spiritual, yet not in the coarse elements of matter. When the spiritual passes from the intelligible to the sensible world by means of art, there is a coming down from the pure ether and element of *incorporeal* beauty into the lower sphere of the defined and sensuous. The pure abstract idea necessarily loses something of its purity and abstractedness by becoming embodied. By coming into appearance for the sense it ceases to be in its ineffable, original, highest state for the reason—for the pure intelligence. Art, therefore, is degradation—a stooping to the limitations and imperfections of the material world of sense, and the feeling awakened by the form, however full it may be of the idea, is not equal in purity, depth and elevation, to the direct beholding of the idea itself in spirit and in truth.[1]

We may, therefore, add to the assertion of Schlegel, and say, that language is also the highest art of man. With the exceptions of poetry and oratory, all the fine arts are hampered in the full, free expression of the idea by the uncomplying material. Poetry and oratory, in common with language, by employing the most ethereal of media, approach as near as is possible for embodiments, to the nature of that which they embody, but the latter is infinitely superior to the two former, by virtue of its infinitely greater range and power of exhaustive expression. Poetry and eloquence are confined to the par-

[1] It is interesting in this connection to notice that the Puritan, though generally charged with a barbarian ignorance of the worth of art, nevertheless in practice took the only strictly philosophic view of it. That stripping, flaying hatred of form, per se, which he manifested, grew out of a (practically) intensely philosophic mind which clearly saw the true relation of the form to the idea—of the sensible to the spiritual.

ticular and individual, while language seeks to embody thought in all its relations and transitions, and feeling in all its manifoldness and depth. The sphere in which it moves and of which it seeks to give an outward manifestation is the whole human consciousness, from its rise in the individual, on through all its modifications in the race. It seeks to give expression to an inward experience, that is co-infinite with human life itself."

Viewed in this aspect, human language ceases to be the insignificant and uninteresting phenomenon it is so often represented to be, and appears in all its real meaning and mystery. It is an *organization*, as wonderful as any in the realm of creation, built up by a necessary tendency of human nature seeking to provide for its wants, and constructed too, upon the principles of that universal nature, which Sir Thomas Brown truly affirms to be "the art of God."[1]

Contemplate, for a moment, the Greek language as the product of this tendency and necessity to express his thought imposed upon man by creation. This wonderful structure could not have been put together by the cunning contrivance, and adopted by the formal consent of the nation, and it certainly was not preserved and improved in this manner. Its pliancy and copiousness and precision and vitality and harmony, whereby it is capable of expressing all forms of thought, from the simplicity of Herodotus to the depth of Plato, are qualities which the unaided and mechanizing understanding of man could not have produced. They grew spontaneously and gradually, out of the fundamental characteristics of the Grecian mind, and are the natural and pure expression of Grecian thought.

Contemplate, again, our own mother tongue as the product of this same foundation for speech laid in human nature by its constitution. Its native strength and energy and vividness, and its acquired copiousness and harmony, as exhibited in the simple artlessness of Chaucer, and "the stately and regal argument" of Milton, are what might be expected to characterize the Latinized Saxon.

A creative power, deeper and more truly artistic than the inventive understanding, produced these languages. It was that plastic power, by which man creates form for the formless, and which, whether it show itself universally in the production of a living language, or particularly in the works of the poet or painter, is the crowning power of humanity. In view of the wonderful harmonies and symmetrical gra-

[1] Die philosophische Bildung der sprachen, die vorzüglich noch an den ursprünglichen sichtbar wird, ist ein wahrhaftes durch den mechanismus des menschlichen Geistes gewirktes Wunder.—Schelling's vom Ich. u. s. w. § 3.

dations of these languages, may we not apply the language of Wordsworth:

> Point not these mysteries to an art
> Lodged above the starry pole,
> Pure *modulations* flowing from the heart
> Of Divine love, where wisdom, beauty, truth,
> With order dwell, in endless youth.[1]

We should not, however, have a complete view of the relation of language to thought, if we failed to notice that in its best estate it is an imperfect expression. Philosophy ever labors under the difficulty of finding terms by which to communicate its subtile and profound discoveries, and there are feelings that are absolutely unutterable. Especially is this true of religious thought and feeling. There is a limit within this profound domain beyond which human speech cannot go, and the hushed and breathless spirit must remain absorbed in the awful intuition. Here, as throughout the whole world of life, the principle obtains but an imperfect embodiment. There is ever something more perfect and more glorious beyond what appears. The intelligible world cannot be entirely exhausted, and therefore it is the never-failing source of substantial principle and creative life.

In the case before us, truth is entirely exhausted by no language whatever. There are depths not yet penetrated by consciousness, and who will say that even the consciousness of such a thinker as Plato can have had a complete expression, even through such a wonderful medium as the Greek tongue? The human mind is connected with the Divine mind, and thereby with the whole abyss of truth; and hence the impossibility of completely sounding even the human mind, or of giving complete utterance to it; and hence the possibility and the basis of an unending development for the mind and an unending growth for language.

In conclusion, we are aware that the charge of obscurity may be brought against the theory here presented, by an advocate of the other theory of the origin and nature of language. We have no disposition to deny the truth of the charge, only adding that the obscurity, so far as it pertains to the theory (in distinction from the presentation of the theory, for which the individual is responsible), is such as grows out of the very nature and depth and absolute truth of the theory itself. We have gone upon the supposition that human language as a form, is neither hollow nor lifeless—that it has a living principle, and that this principle is thought. Now life is and must be mysterious; and at no point more so than when it begins to organize itself into a body.

[1] Power of Sound.

Furthermore, the spontaneous, and to a great extent, *unconscious* processes of life, are and must be mysterious. The method of genius—one of the highest forms of life—in the production of a Hamlet, or Paradise Lost, or the Transfiguration, has not yet been *explained*, and the method of human nature, by which it constructs for itself its wonderful medium of communication—by which it externalizes the whole inner world of thought and feeling—cannot be rendered plain like the working of a well poised and smoothly running machine throwing off its manufactures.

Simply asking then of him who would render all things clear by rendering all things shallow, *by whom*, *when*, *where* and *how* the Greek language, for example, was invented, and by what historical compact it came to be the language of the nation, we would turn away to that nobler, more exciting, and more rational theory, which regards language to be "a necessary and organic product of human nature, appearing contemporaneously and parallel with the activity of thought." This theory of the origin of language throws light over all departments of the great subject of philology, finds its gradual and unceasing verification as philological science advances under a spur and impulse derived from this very theory, and ends in that philosophical insight into language, which, after all, is but the clear and full intuition of its mystery—of its life.

ARTICLE V.

JOURNEY FROM ALEPPO TO MOUNT LEBANON BY JEBLE EL-AALA, APAMIA, RIBLA, ETC.

By Rev. William M. Thomson, American Missionary in Syria.

Aug. 27*th*, 1846. Having accomplished the objects of my visit, and made all the necessary preparations for my journey back to Lebanon, I left Aleppo this morning at 10 o'clock. For the first few hours the road led over low, rocky hills, entirely deserted, naked and barren. We encountered a drove of more than 500 female camels, and my companions were not a little rejoiced when we were fairly rid of their wild and savage masters. In two and a half hours' rapid riding we came to a ruined khan, with the mellifluous name of 'Asil (honey). The only living things, in sight, were flocks of pigeons, which appear

to have taken possession of the premises, or at least, were congregated there—possibly to be near the only fountain of water in this region. This fountain is a curiosity in its way—being conducted to the khan by an artificial underground canal from, no one knows where, and carried off in the same way, to a destination equally uncertain. The canal is certainly an ancient work, as is also the Roman road, which led over the hills by this route to Antioch in olden times. We came to a village called Oorim or Urim in four and a half hours. Here is a building twenty-five feet square—constructed of heavy, smooth cut stones, with a Roman arched vault—and on one corner a tower, built solid throughout. The indications of great antiquity cannot be mistaken, but as it does not appear to have been either a church, temple or mosque, the particular design of the edifice is a matter for speculation. Probably it was a guard-house with a watchtower. Its elevated position, commanding a view of the desert in all directions, favors the supposition. Urim is a small village constructed out of the ruins of what must have been a considerable town. I felt rather nervous while riding amongst these ruins, to find myself perpetually in danger of falling into some of the cisterns, by which the whole rocky surface is pierced and *honey-combed.* Most of these cisterns are now "broken," but they tell of a large and industrious community, and many other relics bear a like testimony. There are no fountains in this region of chalky hills, and the dirty denizens of these wretched hamlets drink the horrible decoction of the cisterns, all alive as it is, with little pink-colored worms. In five and a half hours is Urim the Little, "without an inhabitant," but *with* a well of living water, said to be 150 feet deep, and it may be so, for our ropes would not reach the water. At the end of six and a half hours we came to Ussack or Asak, also deserted. Here we left the cretaceous hills, and entered upon the great plain of Keftîn. This plain is very extensive, dotted with villages, and enriched with splendid olive groves. It stretches by Maanat Naaman to Hamah, and includes Edlip Riha, Maarat Musrîn, and several other considerable towns. It has the open desert on the east, and its western boundary is Jeble el-Aala and Armenaz. At seven and a half hours is el-Jeny—pronounced L'geny—a bustling place, crowded with cattle, for whose accommodation they have constructed an immense *tank*—it is empty now, and dry as an oven. In another hour and a half we passed Hazzany, surrounded with large fields of melons; and at the end of ten hours' ride from Aleppo we reached Keftîn. Our path led us a little to the south of the regular road to Antioch, and the general direction was nearly west.

This village of Keftîn is inhabited by Druzes, and is the home of

our muleteers, whom we fortunately picked up in Aleppo. The old sheikh—Bu Aby Sherîf Nâsif—received us with open arms, and the whole village quickly collected at his house to welcome a visitor from their brethren in Lebanon. I found a number of them had once lived in our part of the mountain, and one old man had passed the greater part of his life in Abieh, and was well acquainted with all our neighbors. Vague reports about the Druzes had reached me in various ways, but when in this region in 1840 I could ascertain nothing about them. They were then known only as Moslems, nor did they venture to declare themselves Druzes until within the last year. The occasion of their resuming their real name is curious. The old sheikh was so alarmed by the exaggerated reports of the destruction of his sect in Lebanon last year, that he made arrangements to flee, with all his people, to the Hauran for fear lest their fanatical Moslem neighbors would fall upon and annihilate them. Some one, however, advised him to make himself known to the British consul in Aleppo, which he did, and was so much encouraged by his reception, that he not only determined to remain where he was, but has openly declared himself a Druze, commenced repairing his house and enlarging his establishment in many ways; and is also endeavoring to recall his people who fled many years ago to Lebanon and the Hauran. The sheikh gave the following account of the cause of their flight: About thirty-five years ago the inhabitants of two Moslem villages—Armenaz and Kefr Nakherîn—became involved in a deadly feud about some rustic Helen or other. The weaker party retired amongst the Druzes of Jeble el-Aala, who eagerly took up the quarrel, and attacked their enemies. When they came to the fight, however, the two Moslem parties—like man and wife in the fable—made peace, and both fell upon the Druzes. One thing led on to another, until the Moslems assembled from Antioch and all the region round, and waged a war of extermination against the poor Druzes of Jeble el-Aala. They were overpowered, their leader slain, and the whole population fled, first to Edlip and from thence dispersed some to Lebanon, others to Damascus, Wady Zeîm and the Hauran. Sheikh Bshur was then all powerful in Lebanon, and he sent a detachment of his retainers under the command of Ibn Word to Edlip, and brought a large body of these fugitives to the Shûf, where they were quartered amongst their brethren. Comparatively few have returned to their ancient homes. They do not number above 500 fighting men in all, according to my list. The sheikh says there were then several thousand, and the numerous deserted villages on the mountain, confirm his statement. They reckon forty-nine villages, of which twenty-nine are entirely de-

serted, and the remainder but partially occupied. There is but little doubt, that the Druzes settled in Jeble el-Aala before any of them removed to Lebanon. Maanat en-Naaman, from whence the oldest families in Lebanon came, is in sight of Jeble el-Aala, and their settlements originally extended across the plain to that city.

This village of Armenaz, whose inhabitants figure in the above tragedy, gives name, according to Ibn Shiddad, to the mountain range south of Jeble el-Aala. From time immemorial it has been celebrated for its manufactory of glass—a remarkable fact. There is not another place in all Syria where glass is made.

Keftîn is eminently distinguished for its *pigeonries*—long buildings, very narrow and *very tall*—without a roof, and with but one low door, and that ordinarily walled up. The interior, from top to bottom, is full of "pigeon holes," and thither thousands of a whitish gray pigeon resort to breed. They are extremely wild, and live abroad in the open plains. These birds may be seen at all hours of the day, going from and returning to these pigeonries, like bees to their hives. Great care is taken not to disturb them while breeding, and when the young are nearly ready to fly, they are abstracted during the night, and carried to Aleppo, and other cities, where they are highly prized. There were formerly seventy-two of these pigeon palaces in Keftîn—by far the best houses in the place—and some of them were fifty feet high. Most of them are now in ruins, but with returning prosperity they will be restored. I have neither seen nor read of this plan for rearing pigeons in any other region except around Aleppo.

I went this morning to see the *fair* at Maanat Nusrîm, or Musrîm, as it is often spelt. It is about six miles south of Keftîn, and is favorably noticed by Ibn Siddad, Ibn Shehny, and other Arabic historians. It figures largely in the early Moslem wars, and had then both castles and walls—at present it has neither, and not more than 3000 inhabitants. The numerous columns and other remains of antiquity, confirm the reports of its original importance. The *fair* was a sorry *affair*. Butter, honey, oil, poultry, salt, pepper, sugar, cotton and woollen cloths, and trinkets for *the* fare were spread out on the ground, in the public square of the town; and at another place were horses, mules, donkeys, sheep, goats, cows, etc. exhibited for sale. There was quite a collection of village beauties on the ground—for sale, too, I suppose. Man is everywhere and in all ages the same. "It is naught, it is naught, cried the buyer," and the vociferation, protesting, swearing, quarrelling and chaffering of these earnest traders produced a babbling, *bablish* scene, truly oriental, and altogether worth the ride to behold. This fair is held only on Friday, but there is a circuit of

them, and the pedlars carry their wares from one to another in constant succession. Such things were once witnessed in England, and are common to this day in Ireland, and produced scenes far wilder and wickeder than this of Nusrîm. Christianity has but a single representative in this town—a Greek from Edlip, and a dyer by trade.

In the afternoon I took a guide and set off to visit the ruins on Jeble el-Aala—a long rocky mountain which bounds the plain to the west of Keftîn some five or six miles. Having climbed a rugged path for nearly an hour, we came to Kefe Arûk. Here are very heavy buildings of large smooth cut stone, apparently the remains of ancient temples or churches, or both. A few Druze families live amongst these ruins. Two hours further on is Kefe Kuneiyeh, a thriving Moslem town of about 3000 inhabitants. From this place the road, bad enough everywhere, descended, by a horribly rocky path, into a sweet vale, on the different sides of which are three pleasant looking villages, Sardeen, Hutton, and Maraty es-Shilf. The water of this vale forms part of the brook el-Burah, and flows into the lake of Antioch. By a sharp ascent of half an hour, along a blind goat path, where we were obliged to walk and drag our horses after us, we gained the summit of Jeble el-Aala, near extensive ruins called Kirk Bûzy. The remains resemble those of St. Simon, but present the appearance of greater antiquity. The smooth wrought stones are from two to ten feet long, and three feet high. Mortar is unknown, and the doors and windows are square. Indeed there is no approximation to an arch in this whole collection. The columns also are square, with plain, antique capitals, and what decorations appear, are in the Doric style. This place is utterly deserted, and has been time out of mind. Turning south-west we came in fifteen minutes to Kûlb Lousy. Here, amidst other ruins, is a grand church, or temple, in tolerable preservation. It is about 100 feet long, very lofty, and having a noble nave, handsome columns, cornice, with arches, capitals and other ornamental work of a mixed order, bearing some resemblance to the Corinthian style. There are many crosses carved in the walls in different places, and other figures, not probably of Christian origin. Here stands, and has stood for long solitary ages, this temple, solemn, grand, impressive, but without a worshipper. A few Druzes reside here, and the sheikh was particularly urgent to have us spend the night with him, but I had made other arrangements; and after taking a hasty glance at the remains, and the splendid prospect over the plain, and at the lake of Antioch, I passed on to Behiyû. This is an immense pile of ruins, ten minutes south of Kûlb Lousy, and "without inhabitants." The only peculiarities in

these remains are their extent, the occurrence of arches, and of a curious kind of column, swelling out in the middle like a barrel, and tapering towards either end. It was now long after sunset, and gray twilight had let fall her melancholy mantle over these ragged relicts of olden times. The owl, and the bat, darted hither and thither in endless gyrations—the very ghosts of the departed—cleaving the air in a mysterious silence, or *jabbering* their *batish* dialect in the gloomy vaults of these dismal desolations. I wonder not that the superstitious peasants hurry by these ruins, and declare them to be peopled by whole troops of unblessed *jin*, and spirits of the lost. I found my own eyes wandering about in search of some superhuman apparition, and I verily believe it was a relief to get fairly out of these dark shadows, and breathe again the cool evening air of the unpolluted mountain top. As I passed away I noticed several niches, as if for statues or idols. There were many old cisterns also, and rock tombs, where bones of dead men did lie and mouldered back to dust, long, long ago. They are empty now. Yes, the very tombs are deserted.

In ten minutes we came to Kefe Kûleh, an inhabited village, in the midst, and constructed out of the same kind of ruins as those last described. One large building resembles a convent and bears the name; made originally out of ruins, it is itself a ruin, and has been no one knows how long. It was too dark for examination, and moreover it is a hopeless attempt to describe the hundredth part of the remains on Jeble el-Aala. Twenty minutes of rather nervous riding in the dark, brought us to Bshindelayeh, where we are spending the night with an old Druze shiekh, in a house built upon very ancient vaults, and in the identical room in which our acquaintances of the Jeonblat and Neckidiyeh shiekhs of Lebanon, lay concealed after the defeat of the sultan's troops by Ibrahim Pasha near Hamah in 1830. They sided against the pasha, and fled to this village for concealment. It is admirably adapted to the purpose—a wild retreat, a savage abode of semi-savage Druzes, to which no Frank had ever before penetrated. The path by which we reached this queer place, twisted and wound its way amongst rocks from ten to fifty feet high. Against these precipices it seemed often to run bolt up and stop, and yet it held on, creeping through narrow crevices, and dark, suspicious rents in the rocks until we emerged on to an open plain near the village. Perhaps in the daytime one might traverse these labyrinths without excitement, but in the night I found it awkward, and was well satisfied to reach the end of them. Besides break-neck precipices, whose proximity and depth are interesting subjects of speculation in the dark, we were surrounded by whole troops of jackals, whose wild

wail is my utter abomination at all times. Our guide also informed us that there were droves of wild hogs ranging over these hills, very dangerous to encounter, and which he appeared to dread far more than the bears and panthers which also abound. He assured me that the panthers (or tigers as they are called) are so numerous, that it is very difficult to preserve their dogs from them. The panthers are particularly fond of dog's flesh, and will snatch up and carry off the largest of them in a moment. I was acquainted with this fact in Lebanon, where the same kind of panther is found.

These hills, strange to say, are covered with olive trees left to grow wild, and clinging to rocks higher than themselves. They were probably planted by inhabitants, long since exterminated in the cruel wars and fearful desolations, which overturned these once flourishing towns and villages.

29*th.* Spent this morning in wandering over the ruins of this village. They are more extensive than I had supposed, and some of them, in very good preservation. Besides houses, palaces, temples and heavy walls, whose object and significancy cannot now be determined, there are many sepulchral rooms well worth examination. I was particularly struck with one set of them cut in the hard lime rock, with an ornamented front at least twenty feet long, and twelve or fifteen high. It had demi columns and a plain Doric cornice from end to end, and below this, a wreath of leaves and flowers is supported on the horns of oxen. These sepulchral rooms are numerous, large and handsomely carved, and a few feet to the east of them, stands a solitary square column of a single stone, at least twenty-five feet high with niches in its sides for statues or images. To the south of these sepulchres is a large building, mostly standing, called Seraiyet Melek el-Mebsha, of whose royal majesty I could learn nothing but the name. This palace has a court in front of it about eighty feet square, made by cutting away the rock, and beneath this court, is an immense cistern forty or fifty feet deep, and of the size of the court, roof and all, of solid rock. It is still the grand reservoir for this, and other villages; nor has it ever been exhausted even in the dryest seasons. Having spent a busy morning amongst the ruins, I returned to the house of the sheikh where I found a bountiful breakfast waiting to be disposed of, and which the old sheikh pressed upon me with true Druze importunity. From the roof of his house, the north point of the lake of Antioch bore 320, south point, 311. Highest point of Jeble Gauer Dag, 331, of Mt. Casius, 251. Antioch is nearly west, but not visible on account of a projecting ridge of mountain.

In half an hour from this Bshindelayeh, direction nearly south, is

Kefr Maris, where are extensive ruins. The east end of a temple or large church, is nearly perfect, and the walls, columns and cornice of the remainder, are piled up in vast heaps, making it a difficult task to examine the details.

Here are numerous tombs like those described above, but with the addition in some cases of a covered court in front. The cover is made of large flat stones, supported upon columns. I noticed at this place a remarkable arch, constructed of stones about six feet long. It is very lofty, nearly round, and stands at present entirely alone, held together by its own weight, having neither wall nor abutment of any kind to rest against. Thus it has stood while long ages have rolled away, shaken but not shattered, by the rude earthquakes which have prostrated everything around it. We had time to examine but a very small part of the ruins and sepulchres of this interesting place, and after chatting a few minutes with the four or five Druze inhabitants, we passed on to the next village called Kokanîyeh, leaving large and tempting ruins unexplored on every side of our route. At Kokanîyeh many of the better sort of houses have double rows of columns in front like those in Jeble Simon. The handsome remains of a church form a conspicuous object. The walls and nave are nearly perfect, but the columns are all prostrate. Not far from the church is a building altogether unique in its construction. It is supported by columns, which stand on arches, and the upper story is reached by a flight of steps cut out of one long heavy slab of stone, which is reared up against the side of the edifice,—a curiosity in its way, which I have seen nowhere else. There is not a single inhabitant in all this assemblage of venerable antiquities. From this place we began to descend the mountain, having large deserted towns both on the right and left of our path. We passed through Benkusa, and Dar Siata, without allowing their attractions to detain us, and reached Keftîn about noon. Who can solve the mystery that hangs over these ruins? In this small mountain are twenty times as many Grecian and Roman antiquities as are to be found in all Palestine. And their unique and massive style, and high preservation strike the beholder with amazement. I was informed that the same kind of remains abound throughout, what Ibn Shiddad calls Jeble Armenaz, south-west of Jeble el-Aala. And indeed I could see them crowning the gray crest of the mountain as I passed down the plain to Edlip and Riha. I hope some future traveller will penetrate these mountains from Sâfeta, by Kulaat Kudmûs and Armenaz, to Antioch. This route would include the "twenty hours' ride" along the upper range of the Ansairiyeh mountains, "well watered, and abounding in ruins," mentioned in my

former tour to Ladakiyeh. Here is a large field for exploration, doubly interesting because wholly untrodden by the feet of modern enterprise. So far as history reveals the movements of Syria's successive conquerors, none of them penetrated these savage districts. The Assyrians, Babylonians, Egyptians, Persians, Grecians, Romans, Saracens, Franks, Tartars, and Turks, in their successive invasions, either followed the line of the coast, or spread over the great central plains of the interior. These mountains are in fact impracticable to regular armies; and the oppressed natives of every age have probably sought and found an asylum from their invaders in these wild and savage deserts. It has always been the home of the Ansairiyeh, and it remains yet to be seen whether we do not find in them and others like them, the genuine descendants of Syria's most ancient tribes. The comparatively modern date of their present name and superstition, does not militate against this hypothesis, for their ancestors were there before they became Ansairiyeh, and there are many things in their features, their language, customs and traditions, which seem to connect them with a very remote antiquity.

Left Keftîn at 3, P. M. The whole village accompanied us for some distance, and very earnestly urged their petition for a missionary, to reside amongst them, and open schools for their children, as we are doing for their brethren in Lebanon. Poor people! They live amongst bitter enemies, and catch, with eagerness, at any prospect of support or protection. They are a degraded and lawless race, but it was encouraging to hear them acknowledge the fact, and plead to be instructed. There is no reason to doubt the sincerity of their professions; and a missionary would be able to collect all the children of this community into Christian schools.

We rode rapidly down the plain, past Maarrat Musnîn to Edlip, which we reached in four and a half hours—the whole distance may be sixteen or eighteen miles. It is one vast plain, and for the last hour and a half, the path led through a noble olive grove.

30*th. Sabbath.* Rested in our tent. Sent for the Greek priest, who spent most of the morning at our quarters. He appeared delighted to meet a Frank Christian, and had many inquiries to make about the state of Christianity in other lands. He complained of the persecution and oppression which the Christians in this region suffer from their fanatical masters; and was rejoiced to find himself connected in faith with a brotherhood so vast and powerful. There are 100 Greek families in Edlip, and they have a small church. No other sect of Christians is represented here, and, what is singular, there are no Jews in Edlip. The entire population is differently estimated

by themselves, at 10,000, 12,000, and even 15,000. Burckhardt, who visited Edlip from Sermein in 1812, estimated the number of houses at 1000, which I think too high, and the whole population may be about 8000. Nearly all the oil procured from the vast olive orchards in this region is manufactured into soap. There were formerly seventeen large establishments of this kind; now, but four are in operation. The people of Aleppo, Riha, Ladakiyeh, and other places have established factories for themselves, which has divided the business that was once almost a monopoly of Edlip. The priest also informed me that one hundred and five years ago there occurred a winter so severe that the Orontes was frozen over for many days, and all the olive trees in this region died. This extraordinary phenomenon is confirmed by the fact that the present trees are comparatively young and small, and have evidently sprung up from the roots of older ones.

Burckhardt says that Edlip is divided by a hill. The hill is merely a huge accumulation of the refuse of soap factories, and there are two of these artificial mounds instead of one. The great size of these mounds indicates a high antiquity, both to the town and to the business of making soap. A few miles north-east of Edlip is a fine town called Maarra. It is known to Arab authors, but whether it marks the site of an older city I could not ascertain. It has the reputation of great antiquity. About three hours south-east is Sermein, well described by Burckhardt. On the west, and beyond the Orontes is seen Jeble Ksair, inhabited by Kurds, Moslems, Christians and Ansairiyeh. The principal place is Deir Koosh, concerning which Ibn Shiddad says: "It was celebrated of old, and when the Crusaders enlarged Harim they also fortified Deir Koosh. It had a governor of its own —a cadi, mosques and extensive suburbs, and large plantations of fruit trees. It was built upon a hill overhanging the Orontes—and *Allah knows*—what its ancient name and history were," which is our author's usual way of saying *he does not.* It was, however, the capital of a large mountain district belonging to the government of Aleppo, before the time of Ibn Shiddad.

31. Rode to Riha—three hours. The great olive grove terminates at Tel Stomak, a small village about six miles south of Edlip. We saw numerous flocks of the white gazelle bounding over this fertile and magnificent plain. An English gentleman told me that he saw at least five thousand of these beautiful animals in one day. I would not venture any estimate of those we saw, but certainly they did not approximate that high number. We rode through Riha—delivered our letter of introduction to the only Christian in it, and immediately ascended Jeble Arbaiyin, which rises abruptly on the south of the

town. We found the same cool fountain and pleasant summer-house mentioned by Burckhardt, and in much the same condition, and there we stopped for rest and breakfast. Indeed we spent several hours at this charming spot. The scenery is grand, the air fresh and balmy, and the water pure and cool, the very choicest of all luxuries to a traveller in this part of Syria at this season of the year. From this summer palace Casius towers high above all other mountains. It is nearly west. Jeble el-Aala is exactly north-west; Jeble St. Simon north by east, and the vast, vast plain stretches away, away, away east and north-east, until earth and sky mingle and melt into a misty, dreamy horizon on the distant desert.

Riha lies at the northern base of Jeble Arbaiyin, and may contain about 3000 Moslem inhabitants. Ascending the mountain you encounter many tombs cut in the rock, most of them plain, though a few have handsomely adorned fronts. Many of these tombs have half columns and a handsome cornice wrought in the rock, and I noticed arches, old walls, and other remains of antiquity, in different places. Riha has evidently been a town of importance in the eras of Grecian and Roman rule.

From Arbaiyin I walked over the mountain to Kefr Lata, or Tel Lata, nearly east, about three miles. Here are Grecian ruins, and multitudes of tombs of an uncertain age. Some of these tombs are very large. One contained an entire flouring mill turned by a mule. These *Lataites* bring their bread from the house of the dead. Above the principal fountain stands a canopy supported by four marble columns. There a few pretty gardens at the village, but the general appearance of the surrounding country is rocky and barren. Maarrat en-Namaan is in sight about four hours to the south-east, and the plain is crowded with ruins. I felt a strong temptation to spend the day in examining those of Ruaiha, of which I heard very *large* accounts. With the spy-glass I could see the columns and prostrate habitations. My guide assured me that there were many inscriptions there, in the same character as this of Tel Lata. Not far from Arbaiyin is a locality of greenish colored marl, from which copper has been made, according to the testimony of the natives; but whether the ore is sufficiently rich to be wrought with advantage remains to be proved by experiment. This *Arbaiyin* derives its name from forty willies—holy places, or rather persons, who hold their mystic meetings in its dark caverns. I visited the principal abode of these fabulous gentry. It is a large yawning cavern which has been once stuccoed, and written over with sentences from the Koran in a very large Arabic character. The stucco has mostly fallen off, and the writing is illegible.

Left Arbaiyin at 1 P. M. and in half an hour came to Urim et-Jous. Between this village and its next neighbor, Nahly, there has raged for the last two years, one of those unfortunate *blood feuds* which are so common in this disorganized land. Several lives have been lost; and our guide was bastinadoed and imprisoned a whole year, for his share in the business. From Nahly to Ramah is an hour—good road, and splendid country. At Ramah are extensive Grecian and Roman ruins, columns, cornices, entablatures, and all the ordinary relics of a splendid town, incorporated in the wretched huts of this degraded peasantry. In another hour is Maryan; this was the seat of a bishopric in the metropolitancy of Apamia, and was evidently a place of importance. For the last two hours we have been riding over an undulating country, very fertile and very beautiful, even in August. The orchards of mulberry, fig, olive, pomegranate and almonds, are as flourishing as in any other section of Syria; and large oak trees abound, covered with the graceful drapery of drooping vines. Half an hour from Maryan is Akhsin. Here are very heavy ruins of great antiquity; and, indeed, the whole country abounds in them, and weeks might be spent very agreeably amongst them. During most of the afternoon my attention has been attracted towards a high, conical mount, rising out of the plain like Tabor. It is called Neby Ayûb—Prophet Job—and the natives believe that his tomb is there. There is a Willie, or Mazar, dedicated to the patient man of Uz, and my guide amused me greatly by his reverent rehearsal of the wonderful legends respecting the patriarch, which are current in the country. He must have been a hundred times taller than Anak, and a thousand times stronger than Samson. Ruins look out from the top of this mount, and lie prostrate around its ample base in melancholy profusion. But we are now in the vicinity of el-Bârâ and must quicken our pace to reach it before evening.

In one hour from Akhsin, this wonderful specimen of antiquity burst upon our astonished vision, as we rose over the crest of a low hill. There it lay in the long valley below us—an entire city, preserved like another Pompeii, to excite and to gratify the curiosity of successive generations down to the end of time. Many of the houses, palaces, churches, tombs and temples are nearly perfect. For three hours I ran in every direction, amongst and over these ruins, without pausing to reflect where I was, or what I was about. This gratification of a rather idle curiosity consumed time which I afterwards needed for other purposes, and rendered my subsequent investigations more rapid than I could have desired. Coming from the north, the first object that arrests attention is the castle, surrounded on all sides, by an im-

mense number of very substantial arches. These arches are as perfect as when first constructed, but the buildings which they supported are gone—carried off probably to build the castle, which I suppose to be of Saracenic origin; or it may have been erected by the crusaders, who held possession, it is said, of Bârâ for a short time. After wearying myself by rambling almost without an object, I began to copy inscriptions, and look into the details of this old and long forsaken city. I shall avail myself of the notes of Dr. De Forest, who, with his lady and brother, visited el-Bârâ soon after my return to Lebanon. Under date of Oct. 14th, he writes: We arrived at el-Bârâ and alighted at a house on the south side of a large ruined city. This seems to have been the mansion of some respectable gentleman, at the very verge of the town; and if its ancient owner should return, he would need merely to roof and floor his former dwelling, to render it habitable. Tying our horses, we entered the drawing-room, and proceeded to examine the premises. They consisted of an oblong building, with an awning or verandah in front—an addition in the rear, with summer house, outbuildings, and an enclosed garden. The parlor, evidently the principal room, had a noble door in the centre of the east side, opening into the lower room of the front wing. A narrower door on the south side, led into the garden, and two other doors on the west side, opened into a long, narrow room, once divided into two, as I suppose. On the north end of the room are four handsomely arched windows. There are two similar windows on the south side, and six on the west. The east side has two windows near the corners, and three noble ones on each side of the grand entrance, which was through the front wing of the establishment. Thus they lighted their grand saloons in ancient times. Round arches originally sprung from the sides of the room, about six feet apart, and upon these they laid their floors of large smooth stone slabs. These arches are standing entire in many of the rooms. The windows of the second story were not arched, and those of the attic (for they had regular attics) were much smaller. The roofs were *slanting*, and the gable end is still perfect. It would be tedious to describe the various passages conducting into numerous side-rooms to the garden, the summer house, and outbuildings, and to the streets. The stones used in all these buildings are smooth cut blocks of mountain limestone, from two to eight feet long, and about two feet square, fitted mostly one upon another in single tiers, and without mortar. The same style prevails in Jeble el-Aala, and St. Simon, in none of which are there any double walls. Most of this description is taken from Dr. De Forest's notes, *condensed* from necessity. It is sufficient to give some idea of the

meaning of the terms, houses, palaces, etc., occurring so continually in this journal.

In another part of the city, connected with an extensive establishment, is a wine press, with a large stone trough, into which the grapes were thrown through a hole in the outside wall of the building. Within, were vats, the press, the millstone to crush the grapes; and to make all quite natural, grapes ready for the press were hanging in rich clusters all over the walls. Indeed, I never saw the fruit of the vine more abundant or more beautiful than amongst the ruins of el-Bârâ.

I had time to examine but one church. It was a large and splendid affair, 150 feet long by 100 wide, and had been adorned by an inner and outer colonnade, of fine Corinthian columns. They are now all prostrate. If one were to judge from the profusion and variety of crosses, the Bârâites were Christians par excellence and eminence. No doubt it was a Christian city, of the lower empire. But who knows the history of el-Bârâ, situated in the heart of these mountains? It is rarely mentioned by any Arab historian, that I have seen. I do not think it was ever surrounded by walls, and except its castle, had no other defence than what was found in the stout hearts of the inhabitants, and the stouter walls of its massive edifices. There they stand, lonely, deserted, melancholy mementos of the past. The scratches, and grotesque figures on the walls, speak of the sports of idle boys at play. Their chambers, kitchens, baths and garden plots all have their separate stories—and their sarcophagi tell where the proprietors of so much wealth and luxury found their last resting place. But their very bones have long since mouldered back to dust, vanished forever out of sight. The astonished and bewildered visitor gazes upon these deserted halls with sad oppression at his heart. Who may count upon a remembrance, in future times, for himself, or an inheritance for his children in this world of change and decay? Great cities are overthrown—castles and churches and palaces forsaken. "One generation goeth, and another cometh. That which has been, is now, and that which is to be, hath already been. If a man live many years and rejoice in them all, yet let him remember the days of darkness, for they shall be many." Long centuries of utter darkness hang over these great works of the sons of el-Bârâ. Dr. De Forest remarks: The impression of these ruins on me was much like that made by those of Pompeii. They carry us back to olden times, and show us how the Syrian Greeks of those days lived, and how they buried their dead—where they worshipped, and where they gave themselves up to mirth. The Italian city, however, is better preserved—the ava-

lanche of hot ashes proved less destructive than the successive floods of Arabs, Tartars and Turks.

The modern village of Bârâ, is a wretched hamlet of rather lawless peasants. They are at present in a deplorable condition. In consequence of the failure of crops last year the people fell in arrears with their taxes, and about a month ago tax-gatherers came to collect, and as is their habit, were very rude and abusive. The young and fiery in temper resisted, and finally fell to fighting in earnest, with swords and muskets. The more sober part interfered to keep the peace, but this only shifted the battle from the tax-gatherers to the inhabitants amongst themselves. Many were wounded on both sides, and the peace party—not being able to *conquer a peace*—were obliged to withdraw, taking with them the officers of the government. The conquerors, however, were more alarmed at their victory, than at the fight—and to avoid consequences, abandoned the place and fled to the mountains. Thus the village was wholly deserted. Gradually both parties are returning, but they are very jealous of each other, and suspicious of the government. We had been warned not to go on to Bârâ, but nothing else suited our convenience, and we determined to try it. As we approached, the people gazed at us from the tops of the houses all armed, and apparently ready to welcome us with a salute—an honor we were not at all ambitious to receive. By degrees they came to understand that we were not officers of government, nor enemies of any kind, and amicable relations were established between us. The owners of the house where we slept returned only yesterday. They are the most respectable people in the place. The old man, a sort of village sheikh, requested me to write to the British consul in Aleppo, begging him to intercede with the pasha in their behalf—which I did, but whether the letter ever reached that gentleman or not, is doubtful. This little narrative affords a specimen of what has been going on for ages throughout all these provinces—and reveals the real causes which have covered them with mouldering ruins. Such utter anarchy would rapidly turn paradise into a pandemonium.

Sept. 1*st.* Spent several hours wandering over the suburbs to the east and south-east of Bârâ. They are called Mijdelaiyeh, Trorseh and Bshilla, each of which would call for an extended description, if they were not in the immediate neighborhood of el-Bârâ. The plain further east is likewise crowded with ruined towns, of the same age and massive character. My intention was to proceed direct to Kulaat Mudyuk by Ain Sufrah, Kefr Deliûm, Kefr 'Anîth, es-Sufrah, Kulaat Fuleiyeh and Surîyeh, but my guide took me off the road, and it became necessary to go to Khan Sheikhoon. The path from

Bshillah led down through a narrow gorge, walled in on either side by perpendicular cliffs, of unstratified rock, for an hour—a remarkable defile, which turned eastward, and gradually opened into the great plain of the desert. We rose out of it near a large ruin, for which I could get no name, and continued by a blind path, nearly south, for two hours, when we reached Hazarîn, a village built out of the columns and cornices of a splendid ruined town. For the last half hour we have been riding over trap rock, which is the prevailing formation from this to Hermel, and the great fountains of the Orontes. We travelled across the country, and without a road, having ruins on all sides, and passing large artificial mounds, some of which were at least a mile in circuit at the base. A very fertile and beautiful country. From Hazarîn to Maarrat Hermel, is one and a half hours' rapid riding. The soil is a dark volcanic deposit, overlying white indurated marl. Near this Hermel are found immense flocks of sheep collected around deep wells, from which the shepherds were drawing water with leather buckets. Two men labored at each bucket, and they drew up very fast, by striking hand over hand, and catching the rope alternately, keeping time to a low monotonous song. They were a surly, savage race, with a reputation altogether corresponding, and our guide was anxious to get away from them. They would not water my horse even for money, and sternly ordered us off, although we were suffering greatly from thirst. When any of them wished to drink, they pulled off a sheep from the trough, and thrust their heads into the vacancy, contending with their woolly charge for a draught. After seeing these thousands of sheep, one no longer wonders at the vast flocks which annually supply the southern markets. They covered the whole plain around the wells, and the scene strikingly reminded me of Jacob and Rachel, or rather of Joseph's churlish brethren. They appeared quite ready to throw ourselves or any other offender, into the nearest pit that offered, and there are plenty of them. Verily this picture of an oriental shepherd's life and character, reduces the poetic idea down to the plainest possible prose. Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and Moses and David were shepherds. They must have watered their flocks too I suppose, with just such leathern buckets and stone troughs.

From Maarrat Hermel to Khan Sheikhoon, is three hours, direction south-east. The country beautifully diversified with hill, vale and spreading plain, and *pointed* with great sugar loaf mounds. Our route left Kefr Tob to the south. I regretted much that we did not pass through it. In old Arabic history it figures largely. Abul Fida says this place was midway between Maarrat en-Naaman and Kulaat

Sheizar. The traveller, Peter della Valle, casually mentions this as a city near Sheikhoon. This was in 1617. It has now ceased to be a place of any importance. It was of old the capital of a province, according to the Arabic geographer, and I suspect it marks the site of the land of Tob, to which Jepthah fled when expelled from the Gilead by his brethren. See Judges xi. This Tob is believed to be the same as Syria of Tob and ish-Tob mentioned in other parts of the Bible. And we read of Tobieni, and of the Tobienses, or inhabitants of Tob, in the book of Maccabees, all the notices corresponding well with this locality. If the supposition be true, Kefr Tob can claim a very high antiquity. At a collection of deep wells in this neighborhood, where are a few ruins, I examined with great interest, an image or idol, mutilated and left to lie on the ground without a temple or a worshipper. It is a female figure, of full size, seated on a chair or cathedra. The whole figure, cathedra and all, is cut out of a single block of black compact basalt. I longed to bring this dethroned goddess of the extinct Tobiense away with me, but it would have been a full load for a camel, and without a firman I should have been prevented by the people from removing it.

This village of Sheikhoon may contain about 3000 inhabitants. The houses are built *hay-stack-wise*, around the south-east base of an immense mound. The large *khan* was erected ages ago for the accommodation and protection of the caravans. It is in reality a fort capable of receiving the whole Mecca hadgi; and the huge cisterns near it were constructed to secure a supply of water for these thirsty pilgrims. The inhabitants are a fierce, fanatical generation, having more of the wild Arab than of the peaceable peasant in their composition. They were fighting amongst themselves this evening, and this brought to my recollection a magnificent *row*, which I witnessed at this place in 1840. It broke out then, just as the loud call from the minaret summoned the faithful to sunset prayers. The call was unheeded, and the whole population rushed to the fight. The men belabored one another with sticks, the women and children screamed, the dogs barked, and the donkeys left to their natural instincts, immediately got up an independent row of their own, kicking and biting, and braying harsh bass to the stormy concert of their masters. At length the governor with his *posse*, succeeded in apprehending a few of the leaders, and dispersed the remainder to their homes. Whether they have kept up the quarrel ever since 1840, I did not ascertain.

This Khan Sheikhoon I take to be the שיחא of Benjamin of Tudela, although the translator, Mr. Asher, supposes this to be a cor-

ruption of the text for ריאה, which he renders Riha, and identifies with the Riha near Edlip, described under a former date of this journal. But Riha is two long days' ride from Hamah, whereas Benjamin says it is only half a day to Shehoa. The Jewish tourist adds, this is חצור Chatzoor, but upon what authority, I cannot imagine. As Sheikhoon is so near the name Shehoa, and has from time immemorial been the first stage from Hamah to Aleppo, which was the route pursued by Benjamin, there is but little doubt of the identity of the two places.

In 1840 I came from Aleppo to this place by the regular route, passing Khan Taman, Serakib, Mar Dipsy, Khan Sibly where are extensive ruins called Jenad, then to Maarrat en-Naaman, passing a very large and ancient ruin without a name. From Maarrat en-Naaman to Sheikhoon is five hours. Most of this route is mere uninhabited desert, and as it is the common track of travellers, I need enter into no description of those few localities which possess some share of interest. From this brief notice, it is evident that the *interior* road is infinitely the more interesting of the two. It will lead the astonished traveller through a wilderness of ruins past Seijar, Apamia, el-Bârâ, Riha, Edlip, Jeble el-Aala, etc. to Aleppo.

2*nd. Hamath.* It took six hours and a half of hard riding, to reach this place from Sheikhoon. As I passed nearly the whole way in the dark, I shall not say one word about the route. Josephus informs us that Amathus, the son of Canaan, built Amath or Hamath, and any reader of the Bible knows that the name occurs as early as Gen. 10: 18. Hamath is mentioned in all the accounts of the northern border of the promised land, by Moses, Joshua, Ezekiel and Zechariah, and in one connection or another, it is met with in nearly half the books of the Bible. It has never changed its name, except amongst the Macedonian Greeks, who called it Epiphania, in honor of Antiochus Epiphanes. But, with the dynasty, this foreign name also disappeared. Thus it appears that but few sites in ancient geography, are so certainly ascertained as this of Hamath. And yet, since the days of Jerome, at least, there has been much confusion in regard to it. I have already explained, under date of Antioch, the probable source of much of this confusion, and need not here repeat. And after this well known name and locality, has been bandied about by Jerome, Cyrill, Eusebius, Theodoret, Stephanus and many other authors, even down to our own time, we may at length allow it to settle permanently and peaceably in its original home. It is neither Antioch, nor Riblah, nor Apamia, nor Emessa, but simply Hamath

on the Orontes.[1] Hamath has not only been a well known city from the very earliest times, but it has never ceased to be the capital of a kingdom, or of a province, known by this name. Before the time of David, the *kingdom* of Hamath included, as I suppose, the *province* of Zobah, the Chalcis of the Greeks and Romans, the Kunsarîn of the Arabs. By the time David rose into power, Hadadezer had become king of Zobah, and the enemy of Toi, king of Hamath, probably because he had erected a rival kingdom out of a part of Toi's dominions. Hence he sent to congratulate David upon his victory over Hadadezer. See 2 Sam. 8: 10. This supposition also explains 2 Chron. 8: 3, 4, where Solomon is said to have built stone cities in Hamath, that is, Hamath Zobah, that part of the original kingdom of Hamath which Solomon's father had conquered from Hadadezer. We are not to suppose that Solomon fought against Toi or his son, but merely built cities in the provinces conquered by David, of which, Palmyra was the most celebrated.

Modern Hamah is a large town, containing at least 30,000 inhabitants. There are about 2500 Greek Christians, a few Syrians, and some Jews, the rest are Moslems. The houses are built on the rising banks of the Orontes, and on both sides of it. The *bottom* level along the river, is planted with fruit trees, which flourish in the utmost luxuriance, being thoroughly watered at all seasons of the year. The Castle hill is an immense mound, like those of Aleppo, Hûms and Khan Sheikhoon. The stones that faced the sides, as well as those of the castle itself, have long since been carried off, and I found camels and donkeys pasturing on its ample summit. There are no antiquities of any kind in Hamah, and the greatest curiosity of the place, is the Persian water-wheel called *naivra*, of which there are said to be seventy in actual operation. The largest is seventy or eighty feet in diameter. The *rim* of these largest of all wheels, is hollow, and divided into small compartments like buckets. When the rim, in revolving, passes through the water, these *buckets* are filled, and as they rise to the top, the water is discharged into a trough. This trough communicates with a canal, supported by very tall arches, which conveys the water into the houses on each side of the river. Small paddles are affixed to the *rim*, and the current of the river, turned upon it by a dam, drives it round much like the *undershot* wheels of our flouring mills in America. The revolving of the wheels on their axes, produces an exceedingly heavy and lugubrious groan,

[1] Almost the only topographical discussion of Peter delle Valle, as he passes through Syria, is an attempt to prove that Hamah is identical with Apamia.

varying perpetually in intonation and power; and as each wheel has a key and a tune of its own, they together make up the most melancholy concert imaginable. The long loud wail of the seventy foot, Mahmudieh, is heard above all the rest, which fall in from time to time as a sort of chorus. This music is wholly peculiar, and heard at midnight, is very sad, and deeply impressive.

At the time of the first Moslem invasion, Hamah seems to have been eclipsed by her neighbor Hûms. But this did not continue long, and when the Aiyuliyeh sultans reigned over Syria, of whom Salah ed-Deen (Salladin) was the most illustrious, Hamah had risen to great wealth and power. Abu el-Fida, the royal geographer and historian, was one of the Aiyuliyeh family, and reigned in Hamah. He gives a glowing account of his capital and kingdom. It does not appear that the Crusaders ever had possession of Hamah, although they took all the important places around it. Hûms, Barîn, Seijar and Apamia, were each in their hands for short periods. The Moslem inhabitants are particularly fanatical and haughty, and Christians are treated with great indignity. These offensive elements in their character, have descended, as a bad inheritance, from the days of their former powers, and will involve them in many contests with the new order of things, and require many severe castigations, before they will learn to conform to the regime of Abd el-Majîd. Hamah has had her full share of calamities from war, pestilence and earthquakes. Benjamin of Tudela says, that a short time before his visit, it was entirely destroyed by an earthquake; 15,000 were killed, and only seventy-five persons survived! More terrible, than credible.

Salemiyeh is about four hour's ride east of Hamah, and I was sadly disappointed in not being able to visit it. By the time Dr. De Forest passed this place, the Arabs had removed from Salemiyeh, and he succeeded in reaching it, though with much difficulty. This city was called Erenopolis by the Greeks, according to Ibn Shiddad, but I have not found this name either in profane or ecclesiastical history. Salemiyeh is much celebrated in Arabic story. The people of Kunsarîn and el-Kaab, emigrated to it on one occasion, when their own cities were destroyed. Dr. De Forest was entirely disappointed in the character of the ruins, but perhaps he was not in a state of mind to appreciate them, coming direct from el-Bârâ and Apamia. He says the original city was quite large and the streets regularly laid out. There are no considerable remains of the Grecian city. Those of the Saracenic town, are a castle, a bath, a mosque, and a few other large buildings. There are small columns of granite, and capitals of the Corinthian order mingled with the black basalt walls of these

various structures. The figure of the cross abounds, and some of them are adorned with vine leaves and clusters of grapes—a common ornament in these ruined Grecian cities. Abu el-Fida says, Salemiyeh is a beautiful city, whose water is brought from a distance in an aqueduct. Dr. De Forest traced this aqueduct for miles, and confirms the old historian's account of the excellence and abundance of the water. To this alone it owed all its wealth and importance. "It was rebuilt by Abd Allah, Ibn Salah, Ibn Aby, Ibn Abd Allah, Ibn Abbas, Ibn Abd el-Mutâlib, and the inhabitants are chiefly of the Beni Hashem." This is not very interesting information, but it is nearly all we know about the matter, until Ibrahim Pasha undertook to resettle it with another tribe of Arabs, and he would have succeeded had he retained possession of Syria. Dr. De Forest found the huts of Ibrahim's new settlers deserted and falling to ruins. According to the Itinerary of Antoninus, there was a direct road from Chalcis to Emessa (or Hûms) passing through Salemiyeh, and this city appears conspicuous in ancient ecclesiastical chronicles.

Hûms is the only other considerable city in this neighborhood. It is situated some twenty-five miles higher up the Orontes, and may have about twenty thousand inhabitants. When it was built, or by whom, is to me unknown. The oldest Arabic historians call it an *ancient* city. It was named Emessa by the Greeks. The Romans placed a colony in Hûms, and the emperor Heliogabalus was a native of it. According to Girgius el-Makîn, Hûms was captured A. D. 636, by Abu 'Aubeideh and Khalid, after a brief siege, and from thence they marched upon Kunsarîn, which they also subdued. During the ten long, dreary centuries of war, desolation, earthquake and pestilence, which succeeded this early Moslem invasion, Hûms figures largely in Saracenic and Arabic story. In A. D. 746, according to Girgius, it was taken by Meirwan Ibn Mohammed, its walls broken down, and nearly all the inhabitants butchered in cold blood after the surrender. Six hundred were crucified on the walls. This same butcher, Meirwan, destroyed Palmyra. Ismael Ibn Khalid says, "I was with Meirwan when he destroyed Palmyra. He slaughtered the inhabitants, and trampled the dead bodies in the mire by his wild cavalry, so that the mangled flesh and bones adhered to their iron hoofs." This is a specimen of those ages of blood and massacre, and by such means, this lovely land and her splendid cities have been utterly laid waste. The early Moslems were the messengers of Divine vengeance, the besom of destruction in the hand of a righteous God. It is related that Ghengis Khan passed by Hûms without molesting it, out of respect to the tomb of Khalid Ibn Walid—a singular modera-

tion in that bloody conqueror. All the old Arabic historians speak in raptures of this city, its unequalled castle, its splendid temple, mosques and palaces, and its paradisaical gardens. A small island in the Orontes is particularly celebrated for its fountains, fruits and flowers. Ibn Hâkil says it was the best arranged city in Syria. Girgius el-Makin, Ibn Fukîh, Ibn Shehny, and others, mention a wonderful statue of brass, which they call an idol. Perhaps this was the statue of Heliogabalus. They also testify with equal unanimity to the extraordinary fact, that Hûms possessed a talisman which delivered it absolutely from serpents, scorpions and other venomous reptiles. Ibn Shehny, however, who is rather a bold philosopher for his age and sect, intimates that there is some mineral ingredient in the soil or water, which kills these reptiles, and says that if they are brought there from any other place, they immediately die. Nay, he assures us that a little of the dust of Hûms, sprinkled upon scorpions in any other city, kills them instantly, and a plaster of the earth applied to the sting of the scorpion relieves the pain at once, but he does not forget to add his usual note of skepticism,—"Allah knows."

Dr. De Forest estimates the height of Castle Hill at 250 feet, and he says that the steep sides of this huge mound were fortified by a succession of retiring terraces, which had been walled up perpendicularly. I suppose that the celebrated temple, which was so high as to be seen at Baalbeck (according to oriental hyperbole) must have been erected on this extraordinary mount. The present castle is Saracenic, and though much dilapidated is still a conspicuous object for forty miles round. I had it in view, during my tour, for three days. The stone used is chiefly black basalt. Hûms contains the largest *Greek* population in Syria, there being not less than 6000 of that church, according to the statement of the bishop of Hamah. In Ibrahim Pasha's time 1300 Greeks paid the *kharadj*, which agrees well with the statement of the bishop.

Midway between Hamah and Hûms is Rustan, the ruins of the antient Arethusa. It is now deserted. In Roman times it was a flourishing city. Portions of walls and gateways are all that now remain to testify to its former greatness. There has been no alteration in its appearance since the days of Abu el-Fida. The Orontes flows in a valley some 300 feet below the general level of the country, and the road here crosses on a good bridge, near a large khan erected by the great khan-builder, sultan Murâd.

East of Rustan about an hour is a ruin called Zephron or Zaphron —can this mark the site of the Ziphron mentioned in Num. xxxiv? According to my list it is spelled with a (y), but this was written

merely in accordance with the present native pronunciation, and who can tell how זִפְרֹן was pronounced 3500 years ago? In the Arabic Bible however it is زفرون. Should this prove to be the Ziphron of Moses, we have found another important point in the north-east boundary of the promised inheritance.

4th. Started at sunset for Apamia, and in five hours reached Kulaat Seijar where I left my tent, and rested two hours. Crossing the Orontes and riding rapidly for three and a half hours, I reached the ruins just as the sun rose. These remains are more dilapidated than those of el-Bârâ, but are more grand and classic. The walls of the city are, in most places gone, and the houses are all prostrate. At the north-west corner, however, there is an excellent specimen of the wall still standing, and portions of houses are to be seen in many places. The north gate is almost perfect, but is choked up with an incredible mass of large hewn stone which belonged to the adjacent towers. The *grand avenue* extends from this, to the south gate, in a direct line, more than a mile long. This avenue is 123 feet wide, and throughout its entire length it was lined by a row of columns on either side. The columns are of the Corinthian order, and very beautiful. The shaft is 22 feet, 8 inches long. The capitals 3½ feet, and the cornice 3 feet, 4 inches, making the whole height about thirty feet. They stood only 6½ feet apart, and stretched from gate to gate, one of the longest and most august colonnades in the world. Including the recesses, of which there were several, the whole number of columns must have been about 1800. Between the colonnades and the houses, were side-walks twenty-four feet wide; the diameter of the columns was three feet, and the centre was sixty-nine feet wide. The styles of the columns are very various and peculiar—plain shafts, fluted, twisted, and double fluted, alternating apparently at regular distances. Thus the shafts of the first *block* were plain; along the next square they were fluted *superficially* at the base, and *deeply* in the upper two thirds. Then succeeded plain columns; then, with flute *twisted.* In one or two places the shafts were plain below and fluted above. In some places the flute was concave, in others convex, and some had a square elevated *rib* between the flutes. The cross streets were all *colonnaded* with a smaller column, generally plain. Besides these, there were large quadrangular recesses on both sides of the grand avenue, which were colonnaded all round. The columns in one of these places were four feet in diameter, and thirty-four feet high. The walls of this recess are prodigiously strong and massy, and the colonnade though prostrate is perfect—pedestal, shaft, capital and cornice,

all in their proper position. The length of the blocks of cornice is ten feet, three inches. When fresh from the hand of the architect, this street must have been magnificent beyond compare. As one entered the lofty gateway at the north and cast his eye down the long avenue to the distant exit at the south, he must have been bewildered and overwhelmed with the sublimity of the scene.

The streets appeared to cross at right angles, and at regular intervals. They were colonnaded, and numerous groups of columns in different places point out the sites of churches, temples, palaces, markets, and other public edifices. About the middle of the grand avenue is a statue of Bacchus, in front of a building on the east side of the street. It has been intentionally defaced, but the right hand holds a wand, and the left still grasps a vine whose luxuriant leaves and clusters are woven into a canopy, to shield his head from the burning rays of the sun. Near this, the columns are very peculiar, having at the base a convex flute with a square rib between the flutes, while the upper half is a bold straight concave flute. Some distance further on is a large column in the centre of the avenue; but the details of this wonderful avenue are too numerous and complicated for my pen and page. One wanders from square to square, amazed at the amount and variety of the architecture until the bewildered mind ceases to note particulars. The gates (if the northern one is an example) were truly magnificent. With difficulty I climbed to the top, over a prodigious accumulation of ruins and from this lofty station, obtained a perfect view of the ground plot of this once splendid city. It is now an utter ruin—not one house has been spared. "The Lord hath stretched over it the line of Samaria and the plummet of the house of Ahab, and hath wiped it as a man wipeth a dish, turning it upside down."

The modern village is almost entirely contained in the castle called Kulaat Mudyuk, which crowns the top of a large mound, a short distance from the south-west corner of the ancient city. This castle was occupied in 1812 by the rebel chief Milly Ismayil, and Burckhardt was afraid to enter it, and thus failed to see the most remarkable ruins in northern Syria. The present castle appears to be Saracenic.

There is a fine old khan outside the castle, and a short distance to the south-east are some buildings of an undefined character, but evidently belonging to the original city. The plain of the Orontes is about 300 feet below the level of the old city, and at this place may be six miles across. It is very *marshy*, and appears to reach to the base of the Ansairiyeh mountains. Through this low vale the Orontes meanders, generally near the western hills. Large fountains rise near Castle Hill, whose sluggish and tepid waters are densely crowded

with a peculiar kind of fish named Sellure by the Arabs, but called simply black fish by Burckhardt. It is said to have a head resembling that of a cat, and from thence its name. The present governor of the castle farms the fishery for 400 purses, (a purse is about twenty-three dollars,) and is supposed to make an excellent thing out of it. In Burckhardt's time it was valued at 120 purses. This fishery is celebrated all over Syria, and Apamia no doubt owed its existence to this inexhaustible source of wealth. The quantity of fish is quite amazing. I was assured that in cold weather they collect around the tepid fountains in such incredible multitudes, as to render it difficult to row the fishing boats, and the fishermen throw their spears at random, and never fail to bring up one or more victims.

There is a small lake to the south of the castle called et-Turimsey, and a larger one to the north, which Burckhardt says is formed by the tepid fountain Ain et-Tâkâ. These are no doubt the two lakes of Apamia which Abu el-Fida describes as consisting of "an innumerable number of small ponds overgrown with cane and rushes. The largest of these ponds are two, one north and the other south of Apamia, and the water is from the Orontes which passes through them, and issues at the north. The most southerly, is the lake of Apamia proper, its width is half a parasang, and its depth about the height of a man. The bottom is soft, deep mud, so that no one can stand on it. It is surrounded on all sides by cane and willow brakes, and the centre is covered with flags and reeds so that the water cannot be seen at a distance. It is crowded with ducks, geese, storks, and other aquatic birds, some of which I have seen nowhere else. In the spring it is covered with a plant called نيلوفر الاصغر *the little Nilofer*, whose large leaves and flowers entirely conceal the water from view, and the boatmen row up and down amongst these flowers, on their fishing excursions." As Abu el-Fida was king of Hamah, he must have been familiar with these localities, and his descriptions appear to me more graphic and correct than those of Burckhardt who passed up the western side of the valley on his way to Hamah. The whole vale of the Orontes here is called el-Ghâb, and is strikingly beautiful. A deep gray fog slept heavily on its quiet bosom when I first looked upon it at early dawn. As the sun rose, it became agitated in an extraordinary manner, broke up into large detachments, and soon began to skulk along the western mountains like the flying squadrons of a defeated army, until it finally vanished in thin air. Then was revealed the lovely Bukah, with its rivulets like threads of silver, and its pools and lakes gleaming in the morning sun like molten mir-

rors. Beyond and above, towered the western mountains, steep, stern and dark—a wall of basalt built up to the clouds—as if to guard the quiet scene below. I shall not soon forget the picture.

The earliest mention of Apamia, that I have seen, is in the book of Judith, where it occurs as the name of a province of Syria into which Holofernes, the general of Nebuchadnezzar, came on his way to Palestine. Long after this there was a Grecian province called Apamene, from this city. The common account is that Seleucus Nicator not only built it, but also named it after his wife. This I suppose to be the correct account, and the occurrence of the name in Judith indicates that the author wrote several hundred years subsequent to the events which he pretends to describe. Its Grecian and Roman story is pretty well known. Josephus informs us that in his day the Jews of Apamia were protected, while in most other cities they were cruelly massacred. It was famous as a metropolitan see for many centuries, and figures in old church chronicles. Abu el-Fida, in his anti-Islamic history informs us that the king of Persia (Chosroes I suppose) took and burnt Apamia in the reign of one of the Justinians, (he does not say which). It participated in all the calamities of the Moslem wars, and was utterly overthrown by the dreadful earthquake of 1157. Probably it never was rebuilt, although the crusaders had possession of it for a short time. With reluctance I tore myself from these fascinating ruins, and returned to Sheizar. The plain all the way is level, and of surpassing fertility, but without a single inhabitant. We crossed the Orontes on a long bridge of ten arches, having a flouring mill upon it.

Sheizar, spelled شيزر by Abu el-Fida, سيجار Seijar by Burckhardt, is a large old castle, occupying a high triangular point, where the Orontes bursts through the rocky barrier from the elevation of Hamah, and enters the low wet plains of Apamia. The position is very strong. The Orontes forms an impracticable pass on the east; the north and west sides are perpendicular precipices, and the south is defended by a ditch, wall and towers, all however in a very dilapidated condition. The main entrance is by a fine Saracenic gate at the north-east corner, low down near the Orontes, and so protected as to render it very difficult to force. The present village is within the walls, and the inhabitants need all the protection which they can afford, to defend them from the wild Ansairiyeh robbers who prowl about in search of prey. A few irregular cavalry are stationed here to assist in keeping the country quiet, and all together seemed but very indifferently. From the bridge below the castle the river flows

nearly west, until it approaches the mountains, when it follows their base, running northward to the latitude of Antioch. I see no indication of great antiquity about this castle, and yet its position must have made it, in all ages, a place of importance. It commands the ford and pass, by which the great road from Antioch to Hamah, by Apamia probably passed, as there is no other practicable ford in this vicinity. I suppose this castle occupies the site of the Larissa of the Itineraries. That city was midway between Hamah and Apamia, and the distance of sixteen miles from each corresponds with that of Sheizar. There are many Saracenic inscriptions on the gateways, towers, etc. and in one of the latter I was told that the tomb of Baldwin the crusader is to be seen. *I* did not see it. Strange stories are current among the peasants about this same *infidel* and his *unblessed* generation of bloody warriors.

On the east side of the Orontes, opposite the castle, is an abrupt cretaceous hill full of artificial caverns, in which a sort of Troglodytes, wild and savage, reside. A long tunnel conducts a branch of the Orontes from some distant point above through this hill, and it gushes out into a canal directly below these cavernous abodes. It was in full play all this afternoon, and formed a noisy, sparkling cascade down the precipice. The water is conducted over the plantations of Sheizar.

As these notes have already extended far beyond their intended limits, we must hurry over the remainder, by making long stages. A ride of eighteen hours, mostly by night, brought me to Naiyim, at the south-west corner of Lake Kedes. Rode all the way from Sheizar to Tel Dahab in the dark, a distance of nine hours. Of the route I say nothing but that it was generally level, and everywhere covered with black trap rocks. The direction was south, a little west. In 1840 I came to this same place in nine and a half hours, direct from Hamah. The only places on this route which I have time to mention are Barîn and Faradise. Abu el-Fida says Barîn is a day's journey south-west of Hamah, a small city with a castle, and near it are ruins marking an ancient and celebrated town called Rafaniyeh. The crusaders built a castle here in 480 (Moslem time), but it was soon taken and destroyed. This same author, however, in his anti-Islamic history says, that Nebuchadnezzar, on his way to attack Jerusalem, took both Barîn and Rafaniyeh, as if both existed at that early day. About an hour further west than Barîn is Faradise, a wretched village. Is this the Paradisus mentioned by Ptolemy as one of the towns belonging to Laodicea Caliosa? It might well fall within the sub-province of Laodicea, and its position as to public roads would make

it known to foreigners and strangers. From Tel Dahab I passed in 1840 over the mountains to Kulaat Husn and the great convent of St. George, and from thence to Tripoli. Now, however, we are going south by Kefr Laha, Tel Dow, to el-Burj, to et-Tellûl, to Merj el-Kuttah, to Ram el-Anz, to Em el-Adâm, to Khubet Ghazy, to Dibbeen, to Naiyim. The whole ride, eight and a half hours, over rolling plains of black basalt, with the Ansairiyeh hills to the west of us, and Hûms in sight all day to the east. Nearly opposite Hûms the western hills are so low, or the plain is so high, that we could see over to the castle of Husn, which is a long way down the Mediterranean side of the mountains. The inhabitants of all this region are Ansairiyeh, and, including the district of Husn, there are more than 400 villages belonging to this strange people. A Frank had never before passed amongst them, and they were very austere and even threatening in their carriage towards us. From this village of Naiyim the castle of Hûms bears 60, and the line passes through the centre of the lake, Kulaat Husn, 320; north end of Lebanon, 245; highest point of Anti-Lebanon, 175; end of Anti-Lebanon where it falls down to the plain, 115; Ksair, a large Christian village some eight miles east, 105.

The borders of the lake of Kedes are very fertile, and planted with white Durrabs, a kind of corn, which grows like broom-corn in America, and produces a large crop of a small white grain, which does not make very palatable bread to strangers. It is however the main dependence of the aborigines, including wild boars and buffalos. The length of the lake is about ten miles, and the breadth six. There are several artificial mounds in it, and the water is nowhere more than six or eight feet deep. The tradition is that this lake was *made* by an artificial dam where the Orontes now finds its outlet towards Hûms. Abu el-Fida says that Alexander the Great built this dam, and that if it were broken down, the lake would be drained dry. He says, also, that the length of the dam is 1287 cubits, and the width 18 cubits and a half. According to him there were two towers on it; at present there is but one, called Burj sit-Belkis.

Dr. De Forest in going from Hamah to the lake passed between my route and Hûms, turning down south-east from Deir Faradise. Four hours from this place he came to ed-Deisunîyeh, a village with Grecian ruins.

The people of Naiyim inform me, that the low grounds between this and the lake were formerly under water, and have only been cultivated for the last few years. They suppose the amount of water from the great fountains of Ain Termure and at Hermel are dimin-

ishing;—more likely that the dam at Burj sit-Belkis is wearing away. The lake abounds in fish, eels and *leeches*, and the only Frank ever seen at Naiyim, was a Greek in search of leeches. Naiyim is under the governor of Husn, from which castle it is five hours distant, and seven hours from Hûms. The region north of the lake towards Hamah is called el-Waar, and is said to be crowded with ruins of ancient towers and villages.

7*th.* Throughout all this part of Syria the people are great thieves, if we may be allowed to credit their own testimony. Everything *stealable* even to their daughters, is watched with the utmost jealousy. Their horses are not only locked in the stable, which is always a part of their dwelling-house, but their feet are *locked* together by means of a strong chain and padlock, so that if the thief succeeds in opening the door, he cannot get the horse away without breaking either the lock or the chain, both which are difficult operations. And yet theft is common. We were advised to keep a sharp look out, and did so, but had several small articles purloined from our tent last night. The *Arabs* who encamp on these plains are thieves by birthright, and perhaps the regular inhabitants have taken up the trade in self-defence. They have had very little intercourse with Europeans, and know nothing of their inventions. A large company were startled quite out of their dignified self-possession, on seeing a lucifer match ignited by drawing it across the sole of my boot, and looked upon the man who could draw fire out of his foot with a mixture of admiration and terror quite comical to behold. At Deysunîyeh they were equally astounded to see Dr. De Forest write with a lead pencil, and because he touched it to his tongue occasionally, they exclaimed, "Wonderful man, whose inkstand is in his mouth!"

From Naiyim we rode to Tel Neby Min Dow, one hour east a little south. Here is a considerable village on a large *tel*, or artificial mound. The whitewashed tomb of the *Neby* is a conspicuous object for many miles in all directions, and from its summit you enjoy a wide and beautiful prospect, and one rich in historic associations. *There* is the bold termination of Anti-Lebanon, and the still loftier head of "sainted Lebanon" on a parallel directly west of it, with the deep narrow opening into Celœ-Syria between the two. On the west are the long dark hills of the Ansairiyeh, crowded with villages. Yonder, opposite to Husn is the famous "entrance into Hamah," and beyond it the city itself, with Hûms south-east of it. To the east spread the boundless plains of central Syria sweeping round the noble base of Anti-Lebanon, and falling off far away "towards the sun-rising" and "the river"—Euphrates. There is Ziphron in ruins, and

beyond it is Zedad, and returning southward is "Riblah east of Ain." Beneath my feet, on either side of this *tel*, the two main branches of the Orontes glide slily amidst canes and reeds into yonder pretty lake, and at the base of the *tel*, lie scattered about, the columns and capitals of the ancient city Kedes, from which the lake derives its name. The first modern visitor, standing all alone in the centre of this circle of names and stations, drawn by the compass of Divine inspiration, 4000 years ago, may be pardoned for dwelling, with a little enthusiasm, upon the glorious and impressive scene around him.

As intimated above, the ruins of the Grecian city called Kedes, also Kudianos, are spread around the southern base of this large *tel*. Kudianos appears to be merely the Greek form of the original name Kedes, and no doubt the lake took its name from this city. It was large, walled, and ditched in such a manner as to convey the water from one branch of the Orontes to the other, thus forming an island like a delta in the *fork* of the river, inclosing the *tel*. The ruins consist of numerous columns, foundations, and small portions of the original wall—the rubble work of which was made of Roman brick. The main branch of the Orontes is on the east, and the short river Mukadiyeh, on the west. This latter stream flows from a great fountain a few miles south of Kedes, called el-Tennure, which our old Ansairiyeh guide assured me had no bottom, and furthermore, that out of it issued Noah's flood, which was all he knew about the deluge. This fountain forms a small lake, shaped like a crescent, and the stream at Kedes is about forty feet wide and three feet deep. There appears to have been a very ancient town on the margin of the little lake. In fact the whole luxuriant plain hereabouts was undoubtedly filled with a dense population. I found the people of the Tel breaking up the columns of Kedes to burn into lime, and, as in this trap rock region limestone is scarce, this process of destruction may have been going on for a thousand years, and the wonder is that such a number of columns have escaped their barbarous sledges. I have not been able to meet with even the name of this fine city in any old author.

I have the list of villages situated all round this *tel*, but cannot spare room for even their names. Leaving Kedes we came in forty minutes to ruins called Ksair el-Gharb.

In twenty minutes from this locality we passed the bridge of Ksair, where there is a mill and some old fashioned buildings, which any century of the past might claim, so far as architectural features are concerned. On the east of the Orontes is a large village called Zerruah, and west of our path is Zeitah, where Dr. De Forest found some ancient ruins deserving of a more careful examination. In two

hours' more hard riding through unbroken fields of white *dhourra*, described above, we reached the ford of Riblah. The river here is about fifty yards wide and eighteen inches deep, flowing with great velocity over a hard sand and *pebbly* bottom. Riblah is a small village, prettily situated on the east bank of the Orontes, and surrounded on all sides by a luxuriant and well watered plain—a noble campground for great armies—having boundless space for tents, and vast pastures for the foraging of cavalry. The eastern boundary line of Israel's inheritance passed down by this place, *en route* to Chenerith or Tiberias—and here the kings of Babylon and of Egypt fixed their permanent camps, while engaged in the subjugation of Syria and Palestine. Here Zedekiah was brought to Nebuchadnezzar, and his sons were slaughtered before his eyes, which were then "put out." Barbarous refinement of cruelty!—to gaze upon the slaughter of his sons was the last office which the eyes of this royal parent were allowed to perform!—2 Kings 25: 7. This was also Pharaoh Necho's campground, when he came to fight against the king of Assyria; and here he put Jehoahaz in fetters, 2 Kings 23: 33. What myriads of warriors, from far distant nations, here fought and died, and mingled with the dust of this fertile plain. No position could be better chosen for the permanent encampment of him who aimed at the subjugation of Syria, as she was in those ancient days of wealth and power. It is central, and easy of access from all parts. North and east the plain extends to Aleppo, 'Aintab, Diarbekr, and the Euphrates. Round the bold base of Anti-Lebanon, the innumerable squadrons of Assyria or Egypt could wheel in perfect safety and with ease, on their way to Damascus and the Hauran. Through yonder "gates" between the two Lebanons they poured their living floods into the long vale of Cœle-Syria, down by Baal Gad, Dan, Merom and Chenerith, into the heart of Palestine; or over yonder low "entrance into Hamah" they led their conquering cohorts by Kulaat Husn, into the rich plains of the Giblites, Sinites, Zimrites, Arvadites, Arkites, and down the coast of Phenicia to Beirût, Sidon, Tyre and Akka. We see the foot-prints of their triumphal marches at the Dog River, where the Egyptian and Persian, the Greek and Roman, and the Saracen have all labored to perpetuate the remembrance of their triumphal expeditions. And this very Riblah was the grand headquarters for those most ancient conquerors. The *absence* of Grecian ruins, and the *existence* of others which, from the very character of their architectural indications, may be "as old as the flood," impart additional interest to this wretched heir to a very celebrated name. Near the ford is a remarkable old building, which, at one period of its history, may have

been a mosque; and scattered over the fields, and built into the walls are very antique columns and square blocks, some of basalt, and others of granite and marble. The tradition in this region is, that Riblah marks the site of an extremely ancient city.

The course of the river here is nearly north, but a mile or two above Riblah, it turns directly west, until it meets the rising spurs of Lebanon, when it bears south-west to its source in the great fountain at Mar Marone. From Riblah to Hermel is about ten miles. The modern Jusia is three or four miles to the south-east of Riblah; and old Jusia, the site of the Laodicea ad Lebanum, according to the Itineraries, is thirty-five minutes' ride further south. It is situated at the extremity of the plain, where the last spur of Anti-Lebanon terminates. The ruins are extensive, but not of much interest. The quadrangular foundations of what may have been the citadel, or temple, or both in one—having about a dozen towers twenty-five feet square—are the most striking objects to be seen at this place. The walls are from ten to fifteen feet high. Dr. De Forest found no inscriptions, and but few indications of Greek architecture, which is rather remarkable, since this city was built by one of the Seleucidae—the Nicator, I believe—and was much celebrated during their dynasty. I did not visit it. The modern town is distinguished by an immense minaret of a prostrate mosque. I have had this object in view ever since I left Naiyim. The necessity of being in Abeih by the 10th, which has called me off from many an interesting locality long before curiosity was satisfied, now obliged me to direct my face steadily homewards.

I reached Hermel much fatigued by the long ride during one of the hottest days of this hot season. How refreshing it was to sit down literally beneath the mighty shadow of Lebanon, which rises abruptly behind my tent, right up to the snow-capped summit above the cedars. This Hermel has a locality altogether unique, but withal very pretty. It is divided into several hamlets, by narrow *glens*, each of which has its own lively little brook of cold spring water, now tumbling in careless, noisy cascades from terrace to terrace, and now meandering indolently among fruit trees and flowers, where its own liquid melody mingles sweetly with the dreamy hum of bees, and the gentle whispers of the very listless and sleepy breeze. I was exceedingly soothed and refreshed by the cool, balmy air of this place, after so many days of hard riding over these burning plains. But shady groves, bubbling brooks and fragrant flowers are dangerous things. Roses have thorns. Paradise itself had its serpent, and death began its work in a garden. This sweet village has a fatal atmosphere.

Last year one-fourth of the inhabitants died of dysentery and flux, and it is in a most wretched, dilapidated condition. Nor is the moral atmosphere of the place any better than the physical. This is the extreme north-eastern frontier of the government of Lebanon and the Emeer Hydar—the Christian Kaiyim Makâm—appointed Makhsin of Beit Hamâdy governor, about a year ago. He is a fine young Metawaly sheikh, and most of the people are of that sect. As is not uncommon in these frontier places, he had to expel his predecessor by force. He had a hard fight for nearly a whole day, in which men and horses on both sides were killed. This is the way they *electioneer* in this region, and the higher functionaries confirm the victorious candidate. One poor fellow complained bitterly to me that the sheikh had not paid him for his horse that was shot from under him in the fight. The sheikh and his retainers came down to my tent in the evening, and played the *jened* on the beautiful grass plot in front of it, to do honor to the only Frank guest that had ever honored their village with a visit, as they declared. Many, however, have since visited it, and this is likely to form a part of many a Syrian tour hereafter. The sheikh boasted of Hermel's twelve fountains, each of which would drive a mill, and of their unequalled walnut trees. The latter are certainly the best I have seen, and they pointed out one to me from which the owner gathered 100,000 nuts last year, and sold them for 1200 piasters. This is rather valuable property, but as an offset, it is universally admitted, in this country, that the vicinity of walnut trees is unhealthy.

8th. Sent forward the luggage, and fording the river east of Hermel, I climbed a steep and stony hill to examine the Kâmoâ el-Hermel (قاموع الهرمل). This is the most remarkable monument I have seen in Syria, and I was taken altogether by surprise to meet with it in this solitary desert. The name occurs in Abu el-Fida, but no author, ancient or modern, has given any account of it, nor has any traveller visited it. And although within an hour's ride of Hermel, the people there did not know what it was, or that there was anything remarkable about it, and thought I should regret the fatigue of climbing up to it. How little dependence can be placed on the testimony of natives in such matters. This Kâmoâ is a heavy structure of large hewn stone, thirty feet square, and about eighty feet high, terminating in a pyramid. It is solid throughout, having neither chamber, door, window nor stair-way, either internal or external. The base consists of three courses of stone, each more than a foot thick—the two first of compact lava, the other of hard conglomerate or pudding-

stone. Upon this base is erected a grand cuboidal structure twenty-nine and a half feet square, and about the same height. The corners are relieved by plain pilasters which support a simple, but very heavy cornice. The four sides of this great *cube* were polished off smooth, and the upper part covered with various hunting scenes, carved in alto relievo—the figures of full size and executed with great spirit and life. Above this rises another cube, about twenty-eight feet square, which has pilasters both on the sides and at the corners, upon which rests the second cornice. The whole is finished off by a handsome pyramid, about thirty feet high. As I send drawings, both of the monument and of the figures in detail, I shall not consume time in verbal description. That it is a hunting scene, or *scenes*, I think is obvious, although the significancy of some parts of the apparatus I am not able to comprehend. But by whom was it erected, and when? Its architectural features appear to point to a Grecian origin; and not unlikely it is the work of some of the chase-loving Seleucidae. Dr. De Forest suggests the name of Antiochus Sidetes. There are no inscriptions, which is remarkable, if it is the work of a Greek, for they were a scribbling generation, and could not make a tomb, or set up a gate without writing upon it. A part of the south-west corner has been thrown down—probably on purpose—to see what was inside. I do not see how such an exceedingly solid structure could *fall* down, and if not intentionally demolished, it may remain while "the everlasting hill" on which it stands endures.

The position selected for this grand monument is lofty, and commands a noble prospect in all directions. It marks the natural boundary between the "land of Hamath" and Cœle-Syria. This is the narrowest part of the plain. Indeed the roots of the two great brother mountains intertwine beneath the Kâmoâ. Below it, on the north, flows the Orontes diagonally across the plain from west to east, forming an impassible barrier, in many places, and yonder is Riblah, the camp-ground of Pharoah and Nebuchadnezzar. I was tempted to ascribe the monument itself to the vanity of one or the other of these celebrated conquerors, and the extreme simplicity of the architecture favors the supposition.

(From the Kâmoâ the highest point of Lebanon above the cedars bore 253°; the fountain of the Orontes three miles distant, 255; Hermel, 320; west end of Lake Kedes, 24; east end of the same, 35; castle of Hûms, 39; Riblah, some ten miles distant, 52; Ksair, 58; great minaret of Jusia, 66; village of el-Kaah, 119; highest point of Anti-Lebanon, 135; village of er-Ras, 184; centre of the Bukâh [el-Ain on the same line], 214.)

The great fountain of the Orontes at the convent of Mar Marone, was the next object of attraction in this neighborhood. It flows out from the very base of Lebanon, at the head of a wild and savage gorge, and forms at once the largest river in Syria, with the exception perhaps of the Jordan. It is about fifty feet wide, and four deep, with a furious current. The quantity of water is prodigious, clear as chrystal and cold as the snow of Lebanon. When the fountains of el-Ain and Lebny are not exhausted by irrigation, their streams unite with the Orontes at this place. *Now*, however, the channel above this fountain is quite dry. I noticed the fact mentioned by the governor of Hermel, that the fountain appears to flow out from beneath the *plain*, as though its source was in Anti-Lebanon. But the explanation is obvious. The almost perpendicular strata of Lebanon, *dip under* the plain of the Bukâh, and consequently the water is carried below the surface to their termination, or junction with the pudding-stone, which is the *basis* of all Cœle-Syria—it then *returns* along the strata to the top, and thus seems to flow from the east. I have followed this longest and largest of Syrian rivers, from its mouth at Seleucia, to its source near Hermel; and now take leave of it, in this wild, solitary gorge. Long shall I remember its quiet, mysterious birth-place, beneath the great spreading sycamore trees which shade and shelter its deep chrystal pool. As it now flows, it has flowed for unnumbered ages—and so long as "sainted Lebanon" lifts his giant head to heaven, gathering mists, clouds and snow, so long will it continue to send forth its copious, generous flood to refresh and fertilize the plains of central Syria.

A few rods east of the fountain, and high up in the hanging cliffs which frown upon the glen, is the curious *cavernous* convent of Mar Marone. Abu el-Fida calls it M'garet er-Rahib, the cave of the monk. A Maronite monk at Hermel informed me that it had been deserted since the days of Justinian! It appears to have been a natural cave, and has been enlarged by cutting additional rooms in the rock. The entire convent is solid rock—cold, hard, blackened rock—a significant emblem of the institution that produced it, and of the hearts that *could* find a home in its dark, damp, dreary dungeons. It is much better adapted to become the haunt of some desperate outlaw, than the chosen abode of heaven's messengers of mercy to sinful men. I climbed up to this strange place with difficulty, and groped about through its rocky cloisters without a light, with a sort of shivering nervousness creeping over me, and half expecting to encounter some human cut-throat or savage beast. But the very beasts appear to shun it. There are three stories, one above another, with numer-

ous cells and rooms for various purposes, all of rock. There is not wood enough about the whole establishment to make a tooth-pick. The position is almost impregnable, and it is plain, from the loop-holes, that monks militant of some order or other—of Beëlzebub most likely —did once actually occupy this place. The monk at Hermel told me that they were collecting money to repair and re-occupy this—den! What for? There is not a living soul within an hour of its savage site! But it will not work. There is needed for it, sterner stuff than the soft monkish material of the present degenerate days. These gentlemen now occupy the finest buildings in Lebanon, and have no vocation to owls and bats, or to the solitary, death-damp chambers of such a villainous cavern as this. Tradition points out the track along which Mar Marone fled, upon some occasion or other, over Lebanon to Bshirrai, and it is not improbable that the father of the Maronite sect did actually abide here for a time. But the most celebrated convent of Mar Marone was built near Hûms, and has long since disappeared.

From the fountain, we rode up the valley for an hour, to a place called el-Merouge, a sweet green-sward with willow trees and fountains. The *bottom vale*, along which the combined streams from 'Ain and Lebny flow to the great fountain at Mar Marone, is depressed about thirty feet below the plain, is only a few rods wide, and the banks are perpendicular in most places. Every foot of it is covered with luxuriant Indian corn. We travelled along the east bank of this winding vale for an hour and a half above el-Merouge, and then crossed to the west side, at a great fountain called simply, *'Ain.* It is strong enough to drive several mills, and about it are heavy blocks of hewn stone of a very antique appearance. The village of 'Ain is a short distance further south. This I suppose to be *the* 'Ain mentioned by Moses, having Riblah east of it. The vale has by this time risen nearly to the general level of the surrounding country, and now branches off into three or four well watered and very beautiful plains. I travelled up the western one, my object being to ascertain the *water-shed* between the northern and southern Bukâh. The rate of inclination decreased as we advanced, until this long winding vale settled into an absolute level, extending for several miles. I could not ascertain the precise spot where the water begins to flow south. It was, however, in a very long cornfield west of Lebny, some twelve or fifteen miles south of Mar Marone. At one end of this field, the water of irrigation flowed north, at the other, south, and from this, the vale gradually opened into the great plain of the Bukâh. In this cornfield is the true water-shed, but it is several miles long.

The Lebny mentioned above is no doubt the Lybon of the Itineraries, which was half way between Ba'albek and Jusia (Heliopolis and Laodicea). Conna is also mentioned as on the same route, and if el-Kaah (seen from the Kâmoâ) does not mark its site, I have no idea about its locality, unless Conna and Lebny are the same place. Both lay between Ba'albek and Jusia, and both were exactly the same distance from each, and considering the nature of the country—a continued valley shut in by the Lebanons—the conditions above specified seem to require the places to be identical. Girgius el-Makin in his Saracenic history says, that Akhshîd, sultan of Egypt, and Sief ed-Dauleh, lord of Aleppo, divided Syria between them in A. D. 944, and dug a deep ditch across the plain from mountain to mountain, between Jusia and Lebny. All south belonged to the sultan, and the north to Sief ed-Dauleh. I did not notice any traces of this extraordinary ditch. But it may easily have been filled up during the nine centuries which have come and gone since the transaction. The plain of the Bukâh is much higher than the pass over the Ansairîyeh mountains, near Kulaat Husn. Indeed I suppose the water of the great fountain of Mar Marone, might be carried over this pass and conducted to the sea down the Nehar el-Kebeer.

Night came down upon us, and we soon lost our path in a ploughed field. After wandering over the plain for two or three hours, enveloped in a dense fog, we stumbled upon an Arab encampment. We were in some danger of being torn to pieces by a combined attack from all the dogs of the tribe. Their owners finally effected a truce between us, and we were very kindly entertained by these children of the desert. They intend soon to strike their tents and remove to the plain east of Lake Kedes, as it is too cold to winter where they now are. The mistress of the tent was certainly very handsome, nor do these *Arab* ladies know anything about veils or seclusion. We were a great curiosity of course, and were obliged to spend much of the night in answering their inquiries, drinking their coffee, and smoking their *nargelies*. Of all the strange things we conversed about, not one can find a place in this journal, and with the early dawn, we bid them good bye, with many thanks for their hospitality. The village of Shât is not far from this encampment on the north, and Lake Lemone is about two hours distant, high up the mountain in the same direction. These Arabs call the lake, Yemone, and they spend a good deal of the summer in that neighborhood.

10*th*. Rode three hours rapidly, through the plain to a *tel*, called Allâk, where we stopped to breakfast, having examined *en route* the tall column described by Maundrell. "It was nineteen yards high,

and five feet in diameter, of the Corinthian order. It had a table for an inscription on its north side, but the letters are now perfectly erased." As it was in 1696 so it is in 1846, a perfectly isolated column, with not another trace of a building for many miles in any direction. It is called el-Magazel—the spindle—by the natives. Ba'albek is some eight miles east of this Magazel. As I have been there repeatedly, I did not turn out of my course to visit it, but rode on to Zahley and there slept.

11*th.* Started early, and was at the foot of the mountains before the sun rose. A short distance off the road at the base of Jeble Knisch, is the small village Judeithah, where once stood a temple worth examination. There are other ruined temples on the salient spurs of the mountains which inclose the Bukâh, or in the side valleys which lead to their summits. Some of these have inscriptions, others have not, but I have neither space nor time to notice them at present. I reached Abeih at 12 o'clock, devoutly thankful to find all well and in peace. My own health has been perfect throughout this long ride over the burning plains of Syria, in her hottest and most unhealthy season. Besides accomplishing the particular object of my mission, I have seen much of this interesting land, and have passed over routes very little frequented by modern tourists.

ARTICLE VI.

COMMENTARY ON THE VISION OF EZEKIEL INTRODUCTORY TO HIS PROPHECY.

By the late Professor Hävernick. Translated from the German by Edward Robie, Assistant Instructor in Hebrew, Theol. Seminary, Andover.

[In the last Number of the Bibliotheca Sacra, we inserted Prof. Hävernick's Introductory Observations to his Commentary on Ezekiel. We now give a specimen of the Commentary itself, embracing the first two chapters and a part of the third chapter. This passage, describing the solemn inauguration of the prophet to his work, is one of the most important and interesting in the whole compass of the prophetical writings. In order to derive satisfaction and profit from the explanation of this extraordinary vision, it is not necessary to accede to all the critical remarks and conclusions of the lamented author.—E.]

THE glory of Jehovah is revealed to the prophet as coming from the North, in wonderful appearance upon the cherubim, chap. i. The prophet thereby becomes sure of his calling and qualification to go forth among his people as God's instrument, 2: 1—7. To this end, with the call which is given him, he receives at the same time a complete view of the work before him; its chief purport is the cry of woe against Jerusalem, the announcement of the punitive judgment of God.

In order properly to appreciate this purport, it is necessary first of all to glance at the historical occasion of the same. The time is the fourth month of the fifth year of the reign of Zedekiah, 1: 1 sq. Under the sad reign of this fickle and hypocritical ruler, the misery which had already broken out upon Judah was hastening with rapid steps to its completion. Only a few in Jerusalem in those days of wretchedness had kept their vision pure and unclouded, and full of humility, were enabled to look deeper into the counsels of God which were becoming manifest to his people. The majority were seized with a wretched infatuation with regard to the destiny of the theocracy; a presumptuous arrogance, as if ruin were not to be thought of, had pervaded the royal court. To stand against all this, Jeremiah was called as a witness to the truth in Jerusalem, ch. xxviii. Already, because of the dependency of Zedekiah upon Babylon, there existed an active commerce between the exiles and their brethren at home, Ez. 33: 21. Accordingly, with the embassy of Zedekiah at the beginning of his reign to Nebuchadnezzar, Jeremiah sent a letter which is very characteristic for the condition of the Babylonian Jews at that time. These were in a state of no less grievous self-deception than those who were left at home. By an appeal to earlier prophecies, Jeremiah strikes down their proud expectations of a speedy deliverance, zealously kindled by the word of false prophets, 29: 1—23. This letter embittered the spirit of the exiles against the prophet to a passionate degree; they even sent to the high priest in Jerusalem a demand for his punishment, 29: 24 sq. But the ground on which those hopes were based was by no means an altogether vain one or arbitrarily invented. Splendid prophecies, especially those of Isaiah with regard to the destruction of Babylon as a punishment for her haughtiness and violence towards the theocracy, were in the hands of all. Without such a possession, which in those days infatuation and despair knew how to appropriate and misinterpret, the remarkable and peculiar phenomenon is not to be explained, that, after the destruction of the kingdom of the ten tribes, and after the severest strokes from the rod of Divine wrath which the Jews themselves had experienced, they still

with invincible strength preserved such hopes of the future. So much the more important, therefore, was it for Jeremiah, in order to remove every suspicion that either through fear of man, or because he was bribed by the enemy, he was endeavoring to promote the voluntary submission of the people to the Chaldean yoke, to express clearly and definitely his relation to those earlier prophecies, and to justify himself with regard to his own calling. He took advantage of a journey of Zedekiah to Babylon to send to the exiles his own prophecies respecting Babylonia, and which presuppose the earlier ones, especially those of Isaiah. This took place through the mediation of Seraiah—as it seems a brother of Baruch, and therefore friend of the prophet—in the fourth year of Zedekiah, 51: 59, precisely in that period in which we find the prophetic activity of Ezekiel to have commenced. According to the instruction of the prophet, Seraiah, as soon as he had made an end of reading the book, was to bind a stone to it, and cast it into the midst of the Euphrates, for a sign that thus Babylon should sink and never rise again. This event cannot possibly have been without reference to the entrance of Ezekiel upon his prophetic office. The feeling which after this event again spread among the people and won increased power, was that former sense of security in the hope of a speedy deliverance from Babylon. Moreover the embassy, at whose head was the king himself, and which expressed to the Babylonian court only the disposition of submission; was it not a new surety for the quiet continuance of the Jewish relations, which indeed oppressed for the moment, yet according to the sanguine and carnal hopes of the majority, were to take a prosperous and joyous turn by the destruction of the oppressor? Then it was high time that the people in Babylonia should know what it meant, that a true prophet (נָבִיא) was among them, 2: 5, who, unconcerned about those expressions of the sinful popular consciousness, punished the same, and pointed to the way of God. So Ezekiel appeared upon the bank of the Chebar as the successor of Jeremiah. His soul, scorning the spirit of the age, is full only with the thought of God's judgments upon Jerusalem. In the pressure of circumstances, there is for him the inner necessity for his public appearance as a prophet; an uncontrollable power of divine inspiration seizes him; he feels himself strong in the same, and able to accomplish his difficult work, to live for his new and unusual calling; beholding the glory of the Lord, he knows with immovable certainty how this will be manifested and hallowed in Israel; he goes forth to fulfil his commission.

Thus the manner in which the prophet receives his call involves also his instructions and the purport of what he was to announce.

He wishes for nothing else, he knows no other part to perform in life than that with which Jeremiah appeared upon the stage. The words of Jeremiah, 1: 14, "Out of the north an evil shall break forth upon all the inhabitants of the land," are also the fundamental theme of the inauguration of Ezekiel, 1: 4. 2: 10. But the manner in which the prophet has apprehended this thought, and become inwardly assured of it, is peculiar, and we have to inquire, how he arrived at that mode of representing the theophany and the inauguration connected with it?

Ezekiel's mode of representation, as was to be expected from a man who had become great in sacerdotal service, rests upon the Pentateuch. The scenery described in our chapter, had its origin in those magnificent theophanies with which in the earlier time the lawgiver was favored, and which were the ideal of all the later revelations of God to his prophets. Ex. 25: 22. Num. 7: 89. Moses heard the voice of Jehovah from the mercy-seat out of the midst of the cherubim; cf. 1: 26 sq. with Ex. 24: 10. The place of atonement for the whole people is the special dwelling place of the Deity, where he makes himself known as the Holy One of Israel, and reveals himself in his glory as the actually present God. Here the *idea* of Deity appears as *reality;* what he is in his essence appears in his relation to and for his covenant people. The relation of God to man appears in full and clear light as that of the Creator preserving his love to his creatures, in order to sanctify and save them. Around the ark of the covenant are seen forms in the posture of reverential adoration, holy symbols of the creation represented in their noblest ideal appearance. To them is imparted the power of life which flows from God, and has in God its constant source, and thus the cherubim are the symbolical bearers of that Divine fulness of life which is manifested in creation.[1]

The place of God's sanctifying influence, is thus at the same time the true place of life, and as such, the place where God reveals himself. There the pious Jew with an eye of faith beheld the mediation between God and the world; God as the one holy and living God, not in a formless abstraction, but manifesting himself in the most real living symbol. Thence are primarily derived those poetic views, according to which Jehovah, when he is thought of as imparting of his fulness of life, and as actively present among his creatures, is regarded as sitting enthroned upon cherubs; cf. especially Ps. 99: 1, where "The LORD reigneth" corresponds to "he sitteth upon the

[1] Cf. the excellent development of the meaning of the cherubim in the Mosaic sanctuary by *Bähr*, Symbolik I. s. 311 ff. 340 ff.

cherubim." The consequence of God thus revealing himself towards his creatures, is expressed in the words, "The nations tremble, the earth quakes." All the manifestations of sinful life must sink back into their weakness and nothingness before such a manifestation of the living God. Therefore the God of life is also the God of help, of salvation for the pious, the God of ruin and destruction to the ungodly. Therefore Jehovah is invoked as seated upon the cherubim, Ps. 80: 1. 2 Kings 19: 15; as such he makes himself known to his people in the experience of life; in their distress Jehovah appears upon a cherub, destroys their foes and rescues whom he loves, Ps. 18: 10.

Without doubt, the vision of Isaiah, ch. vi, which is kindred to that of Ezekiel, is derived from those holy symbols of the temple. This prophet, in his vision, finds himself in the temple, where the glory of Jehovah is revealed, and this fact should long since have shown that the prophet borrowed his representation from the symbols of the *res sacrae* themselves, instead of transferring to the temple what was foreign to it. The name of the seraphim is purposely chosen instead of the usual one of cherubim, since the latter has a meaning altogether general and even insignificant, for the purpose of the prophet. The question however arises, why the prophet preferred this change of name, or in what relation it stands to the idea of his vision. שְׂרָפִים according to the Hebrew etymology, is certainly nothing else than *comburentes*, fiery forms, forms full of consuming fire. Every other derivation of the word has weighty objections to it, and does not agree with the fundamental idea of the vision. The prophet sets forth therein a two-fold thought; first, his own subjective calling, the way and means by which he came and was induced to assume it, and what qualified and strengthened him for so difficult an office; secondly, the purport of his announcements, the nature of his work, which Isaiah embraces in one grand, clear and complete scene. The vision is accordingly divided into two parts, vs. 1—8 and vs. 9—13, and the theophany relates to each in its peculiar character. Jehovah appears surrounded by fiery forms, by the seraphim, not so called because of their shining light,[1] but because of the consuming, annihilating power of fire. The seraphim, as well as the cherubim, represent also the life-giving power of Jehovah in creation—only however in one particular aspect of the Divine efficiency. *Fire*, as that which burns and destroys, is the symbol of purification, the means of extinguishing

[1] As many, e. g. Rosenmüller, Hendewerk find expressed in the word שְׂרָף. The verb שָׂרַף means in Hebrew only, *urere, comburere.*

the sin and guilt of men,[1] therefore, the seraph takes away the sin of the prophet with the glowing stone, and thus imparts to him divine qualification for his office; for only a man thus purified and sanctified by God can be his servant, an executor of his will. As the designation of the seraphim in v. 6 is thus significant for the first part of his vision, so it is no less so for the second. The prophet is to announce to the hardened people their punishment; the judgment of God towards which they are irrepressibly hastening. Thus God glorifies his holiness upon his rebellious people; appears, therefore, as a consuming, annihilating fire.[2] The same destination of the people is expressed, v. 13, in וְהָיְתָה לְבָעֵר; they are destined to be burned (cf. Num. 24: 22), wherein is evidently a reference to the theophany. In relation to the apostasy of the people from God, the truth expressed in Heb. 12: 29, ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ καταναλίσκον appears no less in the manner of God's manifestation than in the labors of the prophet while actually fulfilling his office.

If the vision of Isaiah be understood in this way, there is evidently a very intimate connection between it and that of Ezekiel. In the latter the appearance of Jehovah upon the cherubim has also a twofold meaning, being designed in part for the prophet and his equipment for his office, and in part relating to the purport of his announcements, the nature of his work; God represents both what he intends to do *for* the prophet, and what he intends to do *to* the people.

Jehovah appears to the prophet in venerable human form; in boundless condescension, but at the same time in the fulness of his glory. Below him, in immediate nearness, stand the cherubim and the wheels connected with them, 1: 15. The outflow of his nature, the power of his holy sway is active in these attendant beings, whose appearance testifies of the highest powers of motion and of life. The *Spirit* of Jehovah dwells in both, a divine breath of life which moves them as his servants that do him honor, vs. 12, 20, 21. The prophet receives so mighty an impression of the vision, that the spirit comes into him, and since at first terrified he had fallen to the ground, raises him up again. Thus filled and moved by the Spirit of God he is henceforth a prophet of God, 2: 5. The course of thought thus lies clearly before us. God is the living God, embracing in himself all life, and without whom is no life; as such revealing himself in symbols; as such he makes himself known to the soul of Ezekiel; proves

[1] So in Scripture, cf. *Hengstenberg*, Christol. III. s. 410. So also in antiquity generally, cf. *Böttiger*, Ideen zur Kunst-Mythologie I. s. 122. *Bähr*, Symbolik. II. s. 475.

[2] Cf. e. g. Matth. 3: 12; τὸ δὲ ἄχυρον κατακαύσει πυρὶ ἀσβέστῳ.

himself to be a God who imparts unto him his Spirit, and by this act of power and of love consecrates him as his prophet. More mightily than ever, cf. Ezek. 3: 14, 24. 8: 1 sq. 37: 1 sq., did the prophet feel the movements of the Divine Spirit, when his outward path and condition showed to him the necessity of his office. The greater the number of objections which natural consciousness opposed to such a step, the more important the moment of decision in such hours of inward and outward conflict, so much the more affecting, especially in a character so energetic and magnanimous as that of Ezekiel, is the hour, when the spirit of God overcoming all other voices of the soul, manifests itself as an irresistibly victorious power, and the entire life is concentrated in this inner unity, and all the powers of the soul inspired and consecrated to one glorious end. Life is broken in two divisions; the best, the fairest part is found and—chosen.

But the mission of the prophet is addressed to a perverse and stubborn people. However ready and willing on the one side the Spirit of God makes him to assume and fulfil his high calling, yet on the other side the fulfilment of it is proportionably difficult. With willing spirit, with holy courage is Ezekiel to utter many lamentations and woes over the unhappy people, 2: 8—10. Not in vain, therefore, does God reveal himself to the prophet as a *living* God; for as such is he a holy judge of his people. The labor of Ezekiel is only a further unfolding of the theme; φοβερὸν τὸ ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς χεῖρας θεοῦ ζῶντος, Heb. 10: 31. Out of the north, 1: 4, the entire theophany appears to the seer while in the spirit tarrying in Jerusalem; it is Jehovah in all his majesty, who will show unto his people that not in vain does he have in himself and shed abroad a fulness of life; who does not let himself be disregarded and rebelled against with impunity; who will execute judgment upon the theocracy, cf. Dan. 7: 9 sq. The description of Ezekiel's call, therefore, was designed to show to the prophet his true position in the midst of his faithless age, and at the same time to obtain also for those who were around him, a deep impression of the character and living power of Jehovah—the representation of which was already a sufficiently sharp rebuke of their perverse disposition and aims—and further, to show that the realization of the Divine counsels was near at hand, the destruction of his enemies, the suppression of whatever power in the people opposed itself to God.

The idea of the prophet is accordingly essentially Jewish, and in this respect harmonizes with the earlier prophetical writings; it is an idea, as was to be expected from the sacerdotal education and disposition of the man, rooted in the Mosaic ritual, and grown up and be-

come great under the constant influence of the holy symbols of the sanctuary. But as already his predecessors, and especially Isaiah, had employed the same fundamental idea with independent freedom, so Ezekiel makes use of it according to his special need and particular design. He goes much further than Isaiah in drawing minute details; with the hand of a genuine artist he brings before our view, in an exceedingly picturesque and graphic manner, grand, wonderful and significant phenomena. For this there was a special demand in the circumstances of the prophet. He was in Babylonia, and the monuments there discovered[1] testify of the taste which the ancient inhabitants of that country had for fantastic, grotesque and significant combinations of the human with other animal forms. Their partial affinity with the imagery employed by the prophet is remarkable, and has been long recognized. "In the poetry of Ezekiel," says Schlosser, "a Chaldaean and Babylonian tone so evidently prevails, that it expresses exceedingly well the character of his times. The symbolic style, the chariot of lightning-cloud, the dreadful steeds that draw it, the noise of whose wings is as the noise of great waters, the throne of sapphire, the canopy above the throne bright with the colors of the rainbow, belong to the Babylonian temple, to the Babylonian court, and the symbolic representations by Ezekiel are so much the more intensive than those by Isaiah, as his poetry, in other respects, is weaker." No well-informed person will maintain that Ezekiel exactly borrowed this imagery, or with Spencer that he designed to contrast the Jewish with the pagan mode of view. The fundamental idea of the prophet did not originate in the country which had become his second home, but was elsewhere derived, and unconsciously to him was united with the mighty impressions produced by the objects around him. We may well suppose that on a character like that of Ezekiel those Babylonian temples would have produced a remarkable effect; that so genuine an oriental spirit, one that so naturally reached forth after the immeasurable, and was so glowingly sensitive to the indescribable, must have felt himself wonderfully enchained by those exalted and gigantic symbols,[2] and taken colors from them in order to give to his own bold flight of thought a somewhat corresponding form. But in all this variety of outward colors the soul of the seer turns upon but one thought, and that is truly his own, and the dazzling brightness without becomes mellowed in the pure undisturbed mirror of his spirit, in which are united the consciousness of

[1] Cf. *Münter*, Religion der Babylonier, s. 89 sq. *Schlosser*, Universalhist. Uebersicht I. s. 240.

[2] Cf. Meinen Comment. z. Daniel, s. 562 ff.

the nearness of God, the fulness of the Divine presence, and the clear vision of the glory of God.

This prophecy, and especially this theophany, was held in high regard by the Jews in every age. This is seen in the eulogy of Ezekiel by the son of Sirach, 49: 9. Under the title מַעֲשֵׂה הַמֶּרְכָּבָה, opus currus, it formed the foundation and point of union for the later mystic theology in its endless gnostic speculations upon the Divine nature and the world of spirits.[1] No section has experienced among Christian interpreters so variously differing explanations, most of which however degenerate into altogether idle and senseless allegorical trifling.[2]

Chap. I. vs. 1—3. We first examine the chronological data of the section. Ezekiel has the custom in common with the prophets of a later age, of stating minutely the time in which the prophecies were communicated. Some have supposed the occasion of this to be the residence of the seers in Chaldaea, the seat of mathematical science.[3] But it is to be considered that the later historical books also, as those of the Kings, are distinguished by a similar chronological minuteness,[4] and that the later prophets give a much more careful attention to the literary character of their prophecies, to the manner in which they represent them in writing than the earlier prophets do, whose written word is rather the simple imitation of their spoken discourse. In the present instance this particularity with regard to time is seen in the fact, that two dates are set down, the latter of which alone is at first clear. It is the fifth year of king Jehoiachin's captivity—an event so memorable in the view of the prophet that he dates his prophecy according to it, without any regard to Zedekiah, the successor of the king at Jerusalem. With that captivity the fate of Judah was in fact decided; the last hope of deliverance vanished. By this definite date the prophet explains the preceding more indefinite one: *in the thirtieth year.* We can consistently pass over unnoticed the irrelevant interpretations of this date, as e. g. whether the 30th year of the age of Ezekiel or of the exile be meant. The question can only be, whether a Babylonish or Jewish mode of reckoning is employed. In the first case, the 30th year of the era of Nabopolassar is meant. But this

[1] Cf. Maimonides, moreh Nebochim III. p. 332 sq. Zunz, die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden. s. 162 ff.

[2] Vid. Pradus, p. 42 sq. Pfeiffer, dubia vex. p. 768 sq. Starck, Comment. p. 20 sq.

[3] Hengstenberg, Beiträge, I. s. 356.

[4] Vid. mein Handbuch der Einleitung II. 1. s. 162.

cannot be, for Nabopolassar reigned twenty-one years, but Nebuchadnezzar, his son, was already upon the throne of Babylon in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, so that the 30th year of this era could not possibly be the fifth year of Jehoiachin's captivity. The most ancient opinion, according to which the reckoning is from the eighteenth year of Josiah, is, therefore, the only tenable one. In favor of it are the following considerations. 1. This reckoning exactly agrees with the date of the prophecy; there belong to it fourteen years of Josiah and Jehoahaz, eleven years of Jehoiakim; five years of Jehoiachin added thereto = thirty years. 2. The importance of that epoch; the 18th year of Josiah was distinguished by the discovery of the book of the law, the reforms connected therewith, the celebration of the passover in a peculiar manner, 2 Kings 22, 23. 2 Chron. 34, 35. 3. This explanation is alone pertinent to the connection. The latest adversity is put in contrast with the latest prosperity. The dates are prophetically significant, referring to the importance of the prophet's inauguration in a memorable, eventful age. In this way alone is the double date satisfactorily explained, and no well-grounded complaint can be made of the obscurity of the first date, since it is perfectly removed by the definiteness of the second. 4. The fact that Ezekiel joins himself so closely to Jeremiah harmonizes with this mode of reckoning. This appears in the beginning of the book by the use of וַיְהִי which would otherwise seem strange. The prophet wishes to continue the work of another. Maurer's remark: dicit igitur וַיְהִי vates quasi praegressorum temporum historias continuaturus, contains a presentiment of the truth, but needs to be restricted more especially to Jeremiah. This prophet entered upon his office in the 13th year of Josiah; Ezekiel connects also his prophecy with the same king and his memorable reign.

The prophet minutely describes the state of prophetic inspiration or ecstasy in which he found himself. The fourfold designation, (the heavens were opened—I saw visions of God—The word of Jehovah came to me—The hand of Jehovah was upon me) so relate to each other that the first three express the effect, the last, the cause. The exalted nature of Divine revelation is denoted by the opening heavens; caelos suos aperit Deus, non quod scindantur re ipsa, sed ubi discussis omnibus obstaculis, facit ut fidelium oculi usque ad gloriam ipsius caelestem penetrent.—*Calvin.* The מַרְאוֹת אֱלֹהִים are not visiones praestantissimae, but the consequences of the opening of heaven; as the cloud which envelopes the Divine glory opens for the prophet, he has visions of God, he sees the otherwise inaccessible majesty of God itself. Then the word of the Lord comes to him;

the vision itself is not the highest end, it is only a means to a higher end; a preparation for the seer, to make him receptive for the communication of the word. This is the summit and completion of the Divine revelation. But the efficient cause of this ecstatic vision of the higher and heavenly world does not lie in the prophet himself; the hand of the Lord is upon him; such elevation, such communications come through the power of God alone.

The place, where the prophet receives these Divine revelations, is also important in his view both for himself and for his vision; therefore designated by בְּתוֹךְ הַגּוֹלָה. He is among that portion of the exiles which had been transferred to the banks of the Chebar. Here a colony had been formed as the most suitable place in northern Mesopotamia for agriculture. In the district of the Chebar, which takes its rise near Ras-el-'Ain, at the foot of Mt. Masius, and flows through Upper Mesopotamia parallel with the two great rivers, suddenly turning at a right angle towards the west, through a cross valley, empties into the Euphrates at Circesium, there were even so late as during the middle ages many cities; it was an important district in the time of Saladin. Here Tel-abib was situated, 3: 15, where the prophet had a house, 3: 24, probably so called from the rich cornfields of the neighboring valley, הַבִּקְעָה, 3: 23. The Chebar is formed out of an uncommonly large number of springs—some say 300—it might, therefore, properly bear two names, כְּבָר, the mighty, cf. Is. 17: 12. 28: 2, and חָבוֹר, the *binding together*, the *uniting* stream. So then this river is the same that is mentioned in 2 Kings 17: 6. 18: 11. 1 Chron. 5: 26, and inhabitants of the kingdom of the ten tribes had already been led into this country. This agrees with what is said in 3: 15 of the earlier and more recent Israelitic settlers with whom Ezekiel was brought into connection. Thus the place, in more than one respect, was rich in mementos, and of high importance for the seer, living as he was in a gloomy present, and far removed from the land of promise.

V. 4. The description itself, sustained in a strictly psychological character, at first given in general outlines, and gradually proceeding to more particular detail. There appears to the prophet a great, fiery cloud, from the midst of which a wonderful metallic splendor shines forth. The expression אֵשׁ מִתְלַקַּחַת, compressed fire, is antique and taken from the Pentateuch, Ex. 9: 24. Thence it follows that Jehovah appears in the majesty of his administrative, punitive justice as formerly in Egypt, cf. Deut. 4: 24. The pronoun לוֹ refers to עָנָן as מִתּוֹכָהּ to אֵשׁ. But it were a pleonasm unparalleled even by Ezekiel, if מִתּוֹכָהּ were explained by מִתּוֹךְ הָאֵשׁ. It can belong only to הַחַשְׁמַל, and gives to this word a more intensive meaning. חַשְׁמַל is a *beaten*

metallic work, from חָשַׁל, formed either by an inserted מ (as מַחְשֶׂפֶת from חָשַׂף), or composed of חָשַׁל and חָשַׁם as חַרְמַשׁ of חָרַם and חָרַשׁ.[1] To this, מִתּוֹךְ הָאֵשׁ is very appropriate: a metallic work beaten in the fire and therefore emitting sparks.

The design of the theophany is expressed not only by the manner in which it comes, but by the local designation מִצָּפוֹן. According to a standing mode of expression in use by the prophets, the north, the north country, is a designation of the Assyrians and Babylonians. Out of the north came the punitive judgments of God upon Israel, cf. Jer. 1: 14. 4: 6. 6: 1, 22. 10: 22. The key to this mode of expression is given, not in the beginning of the vision as in 8: 3, but at the close, 3: 4, 11, 15, after which the prophet is to return to his usual place of abode. Consequently, as the reader might conjecture from בָּאָה מִצָּפוֹן, he finds himself in spirit in Jerusalem, in the temple, where the priest is expected to be, cf. 10: 1 sq. The expression is entirely misunderstood by those who suppose that reference is had to the pagan conception of a mountain in the north, as the dwelling-place of the gods, Is. 14: 13.

V. 5. The form comes nearer to the eye of the seer; he perceives in the midst of the fire four living creatures. חַיּוֹת, not *beasts* (as Rosenmüller, Gesenius, De Wette), but living beings, animantia, the ζῶα of the Apoc. 4: 6 sq. For (a) their form is expressly described as prominently human, דְּמוּת אָדָם. (b) The reason of the designation is given, v. 12. The רוּחַ חַיָּה that is in them makes them חַיּוֹת. There is the same difference, moreover, between בְּהֵמָה and חַיָּה as between θηρίον and ζῶον, cf. Is. 46: 1.

These four beings form the outer environment of the Divine throne; they stand nearest the prophet, and form, in some degree, the foreground of the theophany, they serve as a medium through which the seer is prepared for the manifestation of Jehovah.

Vs. 6—14. The nature of these figures is more particularly described. Each cherub bears a fourfold face (פָּנִים). The remark of Calvin respecting the number of the cherubs being four: quod numerum spectat, non dubito quin Deus voluerit docere, diffundi suam virtutem per omnes mundi plagas, has also a fit application to the fourfold form of the face. Every cherub is thereby individually a representative of creation and of the life dwelling therein. The ideal nature, the heavenly character of these forms is symbolized by the four wings corresponding to the four faces. Nowhere in the Old Testament do

[1] Gesenius, Lehrgebäude, s. 866.

the angels appear winged, but only those altogether higher ideal forms of the cherubim and seraphim.[1] Creative and life-giving power is revealed in the cherubim, not only in their general appearance, but in each individually and also in their individual parts.

Vs. 7—10. The general thought is, that all the members—feet, hands, wings—as well as the face, have a wonderful, a higher than earthly character, befitting those who are the immediate attendants of God.

The feet, it is said, were straight. This is often supposed to mean a shape opposite to the natural structure of the human foot; they were vertical, not horizontal, as the foot of man. But the peculiarity of their feet is afterwards described. יְשָׁרָה must here be taken in the same sense as in vs. 2, 3, where it is applied to the wings. Rosenmüller rightly explains it: in rectum extensae; wings spread out straight or in a right line, not folded, cf. the contrast, vs. 24, 25. So here; feet extended in a right line, so that the prophet could clearly perceive their form, which was that of a steer's foot. The outward occasion of this representation may have been given by the ox-footed figures upon the Babylonian monuments.[2] The form of the foot is accordingly round, or rather square, and it seems to be a motive with Ezekiel to make this feature prominent, in order to carry out as far as possible the fourfold form of the cherubim. At the same time the feet fulfil the purpose of motion in any direction without turning round, cf. v. 9; they symbolize the idea of free mobility. Moreover, they are glorious in appearance, glittering like the lustre of burnished brass.[3]

V. 8. Four hands correspond to the four wings and are underneath the wings on their four sides. Here, also, the predominance of the number four is the chief point with the writer. No other symbolical meaning is hinted at. Instead of ידו the Qeri reads ידי (manus hominum). It is not necessary to regard the Kethibh as an old form of the construct state, but let it be pointed יָדָו; his hands (i. e. of each one) were the hands of a man.[4] In the last words of the verse, the wings and the faces are again mentioned, because they are especially significant. In the former, the living power is manifested; in the latter, their nature as representatives of creation.

V. 9. The wings were united together, the tips of the outspread wings touched one another, as over the ark of the covenant, 1 Kings

[1] Commentar z. Daniel, s. 351.

[2] Münter, Rel. d. Babylonier, Tab. II. fig. 19, 20.

[3] Commentar z. Daniel 10: 5.

[4] Gesenius, Lehrgebäude, s. 852.

6: 27; and in this way there was such a connection of the whole, that in their motions they turned not round, but each went straightforward. אֶל עֵבֶר פָּנָיו.

V. 11. The meaning is, as the faces, so were the wings of the cherubim separate above, each subsisting for itself, yet two of each uniting and connected at the ends; the two lower wings covered the body. This is a token of reverence; especially the covering of the face and feet is an oriental symbol of the reverence due to a ruler;[1] here the idea is strengthened by the mention of the body in general.

V. 12. The moving principle by which these heavenly forms are led in their course, is the spirit, the spirit of life, vs. 20, 21. The passage is intelligible only by reference to Gen. 3: 24, where it is said a cherub was to keep the way to the tree of life in the garden of Eden —a passage so much the more to be regarded, as the prophet again refers to it, 28: 11—16. The connection of the thought is as follows: the garden of Eden is the proper place of life wherein the fulness of life which flows out from God and is imparted to the creation, is most purely and gloriously revealed. After the fall of man, a cherub took the place of the original keeper of paradise,[2] Gen. 2: 15. What was once the real world for man is now for him only an ideal one. The cherub belongs to it. As the keeper and guardian of the tree of life, he represents the ideal revelation of the Divine fulness of life. There dwells in him in pure and undisturbed energy and outgoing, the Divine breath of life, once imparted to the creation. Wherever this original Divine source of life moves those heavenly living creatures (חַיּוֹת), thither they go. In this connection some writers[3] have called attention to the difference between the Hebrew and Grecian symbols. In those celestial forms of art from the hand of Vulcan, described by Homer (Iliad, XVIII. 374. 420), there shows itself a purely plastic mode of view, which everywhere makes the beautiful and useful predominant; in the genius of the Hebrew artist there appears a fulness of idea which scarcely allows of a sensuous representation.

Vs. 13, 14. The entire form of the living creatures radiates with awful splendor, consuming and destroying, like coals of fire and lightning. כְּגַחֲלֵי אֵשׁ בֹּעֲרוֹת is probably an imitation of Ps. 18: 8. One cannot fail to observe the climax in the expressions: coals, torches, lightnings. בָּזָק = flashes of lightning. The forms move forwards and backwards (שׁוּב), yet without turning round (סָבַב), v. 12. Some of the elder commentators took offence at this, and according to Je-

[1] Gesenius, Comment. z. Jesaia, I. s. 258.

[2] Bähr, Symbolik, I. s. 347.

[3] Köster, Erläuterungen, s. 28 ff.

rome, this was the reason why the LXX left out v. 14, (silendum putaverunt, ne legenti scandalum faceret).

Vs. 15—21. As the entire composition is carried through in a peculiar manner, so the following addition to the forms of the cherubim belongs to the special idea which is in the mind of the prophet. By four wheels connected with the cherubim and which move equally with them, the prophet strengthens the thought of the power and fulness of life which had already been symbolized by the cherubim. The genuine oriental nature of Ezekiel is not yet satisfied; he calls up all the symbols that are at his command, in order to prepare an image suited to the exalted character of the theophany; unconcerned about the form and the plastic relation of the parts to each other, the form must yield to the essence, to the idea. In the entire description there is a constant striving after that which is in the highest degree grand and ideal. What the prophet will express by these wheels he himself tells most clearly; the spirit of the cherubim was also in the wheels; their motions were most clearly connected together; the spirit of life showed itself active in the wheels, v. 21; they bear the name: whirlwind, הַגַּלְגַּל, expressive of the swiftest, impetuous, revolving motion. They are a still more highly empowered witness of the Divine energy of life in created being, and are designed to produce a deeper impression of the almighty and ever-present agency of God as it is mirrored forth in the domain of life to which he has given its being and its form.

V. 15. Every wheel had a fourfold face, looked towards four sides, because two wheels cut through each other in the middle, so that every wheel thus formed could move towards any of the four quarters of the heaven without turning round, vs. 17, 18.

V. 16. תַּרְשִׁישׁ the Tarshish-stone, probably the topaz. The Syriac retains the word ܬܪܫܝܫ, while generally the name of the chrysolite or topaz is יָרְקָם.

V. 17. They moved upon their four sides. Instead of בְּ we have עַל as more energetic. Cf. v. 20, where עַל is employed, to be sure, in a weaker sense for אֶל.

V. 18. גַּבֵּיהֶם the wheels, here the circumference, the felloes, were set all around with eyes, cf. Rev. 4: 6. The eye is the most lively expression of inner activity, the fairest testimony of living power, and especially the symbol of intelligence and wisdom. Exprimit hoc prudentiam acutam et omnium rerum providam cognitionem, ut nullibi in volatu impediri et retardari possunt.[1] This image seems es-

[1] Ewald. Apoc. p. 138.

pecially to have come into use among the prophets during the exile, cf. Dan. 7: 8, perhaps from the influence of the heathen symbols by which they were surrounded, as e. g. the ancient statue of Jupiter in Larissa had three eyes, and is to be referred probably to Trojan, at any rate to Asiatic origin.[1] The prophets after the exile go still further, as Zechariah, 3: 9. 4: 10, who speaks of the seven eyes of Jehovah, wherein both the number seven[2] and the eye itself were Persian symbolic modes of expression. The most confidential servants of the Persian king were called the eyes and ears of the king, as we learn from the classics,[3] and also from inscriptions upon Cilician coins. That this designation of earthly relations, however, was derived from the holy representations of celestial relations, from the Parsee religion, is evident from the Zend-avesta, where it is said of Mithra, he has a thousand ears and ten thousand eyes.[4]

Vs. 20, 21. In going and in standing still, the cherubim had the wheels for their constant companions. In both there was the same moving principle רוּחַ הַחַיָּה. Most commentators[5] understand this to mean the spirit of the living creatures. (חַיָּה understood collectively of the cherubim.) But in that case the prophet would certainly have written חַחַיּוֹת. By חַיָּה, he means the entire living creature, the cherubim and the wheels taken collectively so far as they make out one whole, 1: 22. 10: 20. Not only in poetry but also in the later Hebrew prose, then, we find חַיָּה instead of the earlier חַיִּים, life; so Ezekiel 7: 13. Thus we have the appropriate meaning; the principle of life in both was identical; this was the proper cause (בִּי) of their equal movement.

Vs. 22—28. Now the crowning point of the theophany, the throne of Jehovah and Jehovah himself upon it in venerable human form. The description is founded upon Ex. 24: 10, of which our passage contains only the amplification. Beneath the throne, as the footstool of Jehovah, is the firmament (רָקִיעַ) like a mass of crystal, elsewhere, Job 37: 18, compared to a molten mirror. The imagery in Rev. 4: 6, is drawn from Ezekiel. Under the crystal are the cherubs full of reverential fear, but at the same time moving on with a mighty rushing noise, and letting down their wings only when Jehovah's voice sounds from above. קוֹל הֲמוֹן = קוֹל הֲמֻלָּה, loud noise, compared to that of a camp, cf. Dan. 10: 6.

Jehovah appears to the prophet in a two-fold aspect. On the one side as bearing in himself the fulness of the greatest majesty and

---

[1] Pausanias II. 24. 5. Creuzer Symbolik. II. s. 484 ff.
[2] Heeren, Ideen, I. 2. s. 460. [3] Xenoph. Cyropaedia VIII. 2. 7.
[4] Burnouf. Comment. sur le Yacna. I. p. 209—222. [5] Rosenmüller, De Wette.

glory. Wherever the prophet may turn his eye, the appearance throughout is shining and fiery, v. 27. This belongs to the idea of the כְּבוֹד יְהוָה which the prophet beholds in the spirit. On the other hand Jehovah condescends to appear in a human form, partly because only thus can the prophet endure the sight and live, and partly because the appearance of God is only thus capable of representation, and suited to the symbolic, graphic, dramatic character of the vision. Closely akin to this is Dan. 7: 9. This parallel passage and the clear distinction therein between the Ancient of days and the Son of man, 7: 13, throw light upon our verse so far as it shows the untenableness of the earlier opinion, according to which the Messiah was supposed to be intended. Intellige Christum, filium Dei, qui a patre judex hujus universi constitutus incarnationis suae mysterium ita quoque praefigurabat (Michaelis). דְּמוּת כְּבוֹד יְהוָה; the prophet regards the glory of the LORD as of so exalted a nature that it cannot be described, cannot be brought completely to the view of mortal eye. It is the תְּמוּנַת יְהוָה as it is called, Numb. 12: 8. cf. Ps. 17: 15; a reflection, a copy of the Divine glory reminding of its true essence, but in no way exhausting it. Among all forms, however, is none so fit for its representation as that of man, whom Jehovah has made in his own image, and will have regarded as his representative and deputy upon the earth, Gen. 1: 27 sq. Ps. 8: 6 sq.

To this condescension of Jehovah to the prophet, the comparison of the shining appearance to the rainbow refers. Not only the words employed, but the nature of the thought shows that reference is had to Gen. 9: 12—17. J. H. Michaelis says aptly: Iris est symbolum foederis et gratiae. This ethical idea is present in the symbolic language of the prophet; Jehovah appears to him, as he is about to enter upon his high calling, in human form as the covenant God, full of condescending grace and love. The same is seen in Rev. 4: 3. A rainbow of the brilliancy of an emerald appears around the throne of God—a beautiful symbol there, as introductory to the manifestation of the glory of God in the work of redemption, 5: 12—14. Vitringa says: "The covenant made with the family of Noah is symbolic, and the rainbow itself according to its highest symbolic meaning, is to be referred to that kingdom of grace, which God in the economy of grace in a most illustrious manner exhibits in Christ Jesus his Son." That the remark of Heinrichs, "the royal dignity is indicated by the rainbow," is incorrect, is evident from Rev. 10: 1, where the last angel bears the rainbow upon his head, undoubtedly with reference to the purport of his announcement, the realization of the work of redemption, the completion of the plan of salvation, ἐτελέσθη τὸ μυστήριον

τοῦ θεοῦ, Rev. 10: 7. The symbol of the covenant, the sign of the Mediator's office is there entirely in its place. With regard to the same application of the symbol here, it cannot be objected that the vision is one which excites only fear; tota haec visio fuit formidabilis, as Calvin says, who accordingly sees expressed in it only the idea of the majestas Dei refulgens in coelis. For the condescension of God, his sign of the covenant does not exclude his glory, but includes it. The prophet means to say: notwithstanding that Jehovah thus revealed himself to him and did not let the signs of his grace and love be wanting, yet he could not endure the sight of his glory. Thus the symbol of the rainbow involves the thought expressed, chap. 2: 1; the gracious God raises up again him who was at first cast down by terror.

Chap. II. vs. 1, 2. The prophet first describes the subjective operation of the theophany upon his own soul. So deeply humbled, so prostrate with terror as he was before the exalted revelation of God, even so mightily does the Divine voice raise him up again. Calvin says, "as it regards the wicked, they are so terrified by the sight of God, that they utterly fall and rise not again. But it is not so with the faithful, because in them their natural pride is corrected; thereupon God extends his hand to them and restores them as if from death to life. At the same time the prophet teaches that nothing was done by the voice until the Spirit came. God indeed works efficaciously by his word, but it is to be maintained that the efficacy is not in the sound, but comes forth from the secret impulse of the Spirit." By the Spirit of God is here to be understood in part, the power which seizes upon and overmasters the prophet, and in part the Divine strength in his own soul which shows itself victorious, and in which his genuine courage and elevated joy in prospect of his high calling had their root.

The address, *son of man*, is characteristic for the peculiarity impressed with noble constancy upon all the prophecies of Ezekiel; it is found more than eighty times, and elsewhere only by his contemporary, Daniel 8: 17, as also for the prophet's inner disposition and ethical mode of view. To regard this appellation as a mere Hebrew or Chaldaic idiom for man, and to see nothing therein but a common mode of address, everything forbids. For its frequent repetition with no other as its substitute shows its emphasis, its significance for the prophet. In the next place it cannot be shown to be elsewhere a common idiom that precisely this phrase is used in address; and when thus used it lies in the nature of the case that it contains a meaning

characteristic for the person spoken to.[1] This is clearly evident from the different modes of address to Daniel.[2] Finally, regard is to be had to the choice of the expression בֶּן־אָדָם and its original relation to other designations of man. Precisely in these anthropological designations is seen the peculiar religious depth and accurate distinction of conceptions in the Hebrew mind. While the words אִישׁ and אִשָּׁה are used simply as designations of sex, אֱנוֹשׁ which is etymologically akin to אִישׁ[3] is employed with constant reference to its original meaning, *to be weak, sick;* it is the ethical designation of man,[4] but אָדָם denotes man as to his physical, natural condition,[5] whence the use of the word in such passages as Ps. 8: 4. Job 25: 6, and also its connection with בֵּן are satisfactorily explained. Opposed to both אֱנוֹשׁ and אָדָם is גְּבוֹר a designation of man with reference to his power.[6] The emphatic address בֶּן־אָדָם is therefore a continual admonition to the prophet to remember that he is a man like all the rest. This is characteristic for an age like that of the exile, which felt more sensibly than any other the distance of man from God, what man is before God; characteristic also for the prophet whose powerful and energetic soul needed to be continually reminded of what he was by nature in the sight of God, "lest he should be exalted above measure," 2 Cor. 12: 7. Thus the name was a continual humiliation for the man who was called to a high office and chosen to do great things. Most of the early commentators apprehended the meaning correctly, as Jerome: ne eleventur (prophetae) in superbiam—admonentur fragilitatis suae et filii hominum nuncupantur, ut homines se esse noverint. Similar is the designation of Zechariah by, *young man*, 2: 4, on which Vitringa rightly remarks: hominem brevis aevi, multarum rerum imperitum, coelestium maxime ignarum, non tam contemptûs, quam differentiae causa, appellat נַעַר, et liceat dicere rudem, multa docendum, quo eodem sensu Ezechiel passim בֶּן־אָדָם appellatur. But at the same time this prophetic designation contained an important

[1] Cf. respecting the Grecian address ὦ ἄνθρωπε, *Heindorf* ad Platonem. Gorgias § 15 and 155. Sophist § 30, according to whom it contains lenis quaedam contemptûs significatio.

[2] Commentar. s. 298.

[3] Tuch. Comment z. Genesis, s. 83.

[4] Tholuck. Beiträge zur Spracherklärung d. N. T. s. 61 ff.

[5] Thence its use in the Mosaic Cosmogony, Gen. 2: 7, whence, however, nothing follows for the etymological derivation of the word; the primary meaning is undoubtedly, *to be red*, from the red color of the flesh, especially since significant definitions of this kind are favorite ones in the oriental languages, vid. Frähn z. Ibn Foszlan, p. 72 sq.

[6] Cf. respecting the difference between *vir* and *homo*. *Herzog*. Caesar de Bello Gallico V. 58.

practical thought for his contemporaries, his hearers. They should thereby be taught to look away altogether from him the man to God and the Spirit of God, who spoke to them through the prophet. Calvin well makes this prominent: non dubito quin Deus voluerit consulto proponere ipsum quasi gregarium hominem et contemptibilem externo aspectu; interea vero ipsum attollere supra cunctos mortales, quia dignatus fuerat ipsum dono prophetiae.

Vs. 3—7. His spirit thus disciplined and equipped, the prophet receives his commission. Undismayed by the corruption of the people, the greatness of their apostasy and all the consequent bitterness of the prophetic calling, he is to execute his office.

V. 3. First of all a forcible description of the people, of their sinful course. The prophet does not call Israel גּוֹי, but he uses a more expressive word, גּוֹיִם (gentiles, heathen). Ea voce eos aequiparat reliquis gentibus, ut *non populus*, Hos. 1: 9. Sed eo quod sequitur eos infra reliquas gentes dejicit.—*Michaelis.*

V. 4. וְהַבָּנִים and to such children as these. If the people did not stand in this peculiar relation to Jehovah, no prophet would be sent to them at all; the revolt, the apostasy of the children of God, makes this mission even so pressingly necessary as it is difficult and toilsome. The words קְשֵׁי פָנִים are closely related to v. 3. The shamelessness shows itself in the rebellion of children against their father (סָרְרוּ־בִי), so entire forgetfulness of the guiding grace of God manifested to them as a people in innumerable acts of loving kindness; this shamelessness, this degree of corruption, proceeds, however, out of the inner disposition, their hardness of heart, thence their obstinacy in sinning: they and their fathers even to this day, v. 3.

V. 5. Amid such circumstances, the *result* of the prophet's labors is exceedingly doubtful. But to have reference to that, to act according to that, is merely human weakness and narrowness; in the sight of Jehovah higher motives avail, he desires a course of action with a single eye to him and his ever holy will. In Jehovah and his covenant relations to his people lies the necessity of his revelation; his testimony, his message must be made known in the midst of Israel; there lies upon the part of God the perfect right to punish the unfaithful people; they are without excuse. Thus Jehovah himself wills not merely the conversion, but also the hardening of the people, Is. 6: 9 sq.; so far as primarily he wills only the announcement of his paternal sovereignty and authority, this he must will in virtue of his paternal relation and faithfulness to his people. So strictly, therefore, as on the one side the prophetic announcement is to be referred to the will of God, and is to be regarded as an outflow and copy of the same,

so also no less are its results; the hearing and not-hearing are likewise God's will, otherwise he were obliged to keep back his word. אִם — אִם, sive — sive.

V. 6. In considerations of this kind there lies for the prophet an unfailing source of courage and intrepidity. סָרָבִים וְסַלּוֹנִים אוֹתָךְ is undoubtedly a proverbial phrase. סַלּוֹן a *thorn*, a *prickle*. The primary meaning is סָלַל to ascend, spring forth, thence literally, a projecting point. The groundmeaning of סָרָבִים is clear from the many kindred words, שָׂרַב, סָרַח, צָרַב, צָרַב, זָרַב, *to burn*, cf. Num. 33: 55. Among the Arabs thorns are proverbially designations of the passions. That elsewhere thorns and thistles are designations of ungodliness, as also of hostile and dangerous powers, is well known.[1] The thought of the greatness of the painful dangers to which the prophet would be exposed is strengthened by: thou shalt dwell among scorpions, cf. Deut. 8: 15.

Verses 8—III. 3. The positive side of the admonition. In contrast to the rebellious people the prophet is to set forth in himself the image of an obedient servant of Jehovah, who finds his highest joy in the word of God. The thought is expressed by a symbolic action. A roll of a book written full of lamentations is given to the prophet to eat; he obeys and finds the roll of sweet taste. However difficult his calling may appear, yet the consciousness of being the servant of God is a rich source of far more exceeding joy. The prophet appears acting at once as one who without delay inwardly fulfils the Divine command. Thus the symbolic action is by no means a matter of mere form or fiction. It is the reality of an inner condition, of the highest spiritual excitement, of a true and rare union with the Divine will. It is an excellent remark of Vitringa: "The nature of the case stands thus, the prophets wholly rapt out of themselves passed over as it were to become the organs of God, and, having put off the affections of the flesh and elevated to a pure and spiritual contemplation, they approved with their spirit whatever they saw could conduce to the glory of God and illustrate not only his grace but also his justice. Having clearly seen the righteousness and wisdom of all God's ways, they had great pleasure in meditation upon all his words, whatever their purport might be."[2] The symbol is employed in a somewhat different manner in the Apocalypse. To John the taste of the roll is bitter and sweet, 10: 8, with reference to the subject of his announcements—the contests and the victory of the kingdom of God. The lofty energy of the symbol as employed by Ezekiel is comparatively very much lowered in the 4th Book of Ezra, 14: 38, where only the idea of in-

[1] Gesenius, z. Jesaia, I. s. 378, 400. [2] Vitringa ad Apocalypsin, p. 441.

spiration is intended to be expressed thereby; an illustration of the difference between apocryphal imitation and the living possession and production of thought.

V. 10. The roll was an *ὀπισθόγραφον*, i. e. entirely filled with all possible lamentations. הֶגֶה, *sighing*, as the verb is employed, Is. 16: 7. Jer. 48: 31. הִי, the cry of woe, a clearer form for הוֹי, הֹ, (Ewald, § 440).

Chap. III. vs. 4—9. The genuine prophetic consciousness has its root in God, the ultimate source of life, but, therefore, at the same time keeps the aim of the prophecy steadily in view. This relates to the ancient, chosen covenant people of God, already so variously warned and so often called to salvation; over against their perverseness and presumptuous ungodliness is to be placed an example of even so high and godly courage and the power of genuine faith. Because the people are stubborn and hard hearted, the prophet, in order to meet them, needs a diamond brow, harder than rock.

V. 5. The prophetic mission is not directed to heathen nations, the enemies of the theocracy, but to the house of Israel. There is special emphasis in אֶל־בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל; the ancient chosen people of God, and even now so far not deserted by God as this manifestation of grace is still allowed them. The gentiles are denoted by Ezekiel after the example of Isaiah, 33: 19, as people "of obscure speech and unintelligible language." So had Isaiah already named the terrible foes who laid waste the land.[1] But to Ezekiel the outward difference of language seemed as a symbol of obtuseness, of mental irreceptivity for the spiritual and divine. Non de dialecto tantum, sed etiam de ipso sermonis argumento hic cogitandum.—*Cocceius.*[2] עֲמֻקּ, deep, here emphatic: unfathomable = unintelligible.

Vs. 6, 7. However much the Israelites may regard themselves as privileged in comparison with the gentile mass—they can hear very well, they can understand the word of Jehovah, they are acquainted with it, for it has often come to them—even so much is there wanting on the other hand their good will (לֹא רְאבוֹ) to give heed to it. In

[1] Cf. Handbuch der Einleitung, I. 1. s. 95.

[2] A kindred phraseology is found also in Arabic; cf. Frähn zu Ibn Foszlan, p. 189 sq., where a remark by Schems-eddin is introduced: "The Varengians are an unintelligibly speaking people that understand scarcely a word;" on which Frähn remarks: "In this expression there seems to be the idea not merely of a distant people with whom the Arabians had no intercourse, and who spoke a language different from theirs and unintelligible by them, but also the idea of stupidity, rudeness, uncultivation, as *βάρβαρος* in Greek." Very aptly Frähn refers to the passage in the Koran, Sur. 18: 92, "a people that understood no language" = barbarian, stupid people.

this respect Israel stands far below his heathen neighbors. Among these the discourse of the prophet would find accord sooner than in Israel. אִם־לֹא is to be taken as a formula of swearing, and the clause אִם־לֹא אֲלֵיהֶם שְׁלַחְתִּיךָ as hypothetical: verily, were this mission for those heathen, they would hear thee. The prophet declares a principle confirmed by experience. He is doubtless reminded of the memorable event in the life of Jonah, whose unique history exhibited to the disgrace of the covenant people the contrast between impenitent Israel and the heathen city deeply impressed and moved to repentance by the word of the prophet. Rightly, therefore, does Jäger, although indeed acknowledging the harmony for another purpose, speak of Jonah 3: 5 sq. as an actual confirmation of the words of Ezekiel.[1] The country in which Ezekiel now is, reminds him of that history; he is not sent to those people, to whom Jonah was formerly sent and in whose midst he is now living, in order to call forth a new *μετάνοια* in them; he was to make yet one energetic attempt with his own people, cf. Matt. 11: 21. 12: 41.

V. 9. Cf. Is. 50: 7. Jer. 1: 18. 15: 20. שָׁמִיר, most probably the *diamond*, whose hardness was already well known to the ancients.[2]

Vs. 10—15. In conclusion the prophet receives the charge now without delay to enter upon his new office among his countrymen, and to speak unto them as the prophet of the Lord. Therefore, the Spirit bears him away from the scene of the vision, Jerusalem and the temple, back again to his usual place of abode. He hears behind him the noise of the great rushing of the cherubim and their songs of praise to Jehovah. מִמְּקוֹמוֹ, from his place, can denote only the temple, the place where Jehovah makes himself known = מְקוֹם קָדְשׁוֹ, Ps. 24: 3. cf. 1 Chron. 16: 27. With this agrees the beginning of the vision, 1: 4, where the ecstatic continuance of the prophet in the sanctuary was intimated. מַשִּׂיקוֹת stands here in the primary meaning of נָשַׁק, *to join, to put in a row*, as elsewhere, Gen. 41: 40, with a slight modification of the meaning, *to adjust one's self, to direct.*

V. 14. The prophet allows us next to cast a glance into his own soul, his disposition and conduct. Full of bitter sadness he leaves the scene of the exalted vision—Jehovah's hand sways mightily over him—he remains seven days a mourner among his people. The words מַר בַּחֲמַת רוּחִי admit of various explanation. The interpretation of Grotius has become quite common: valde tristis ob mala imminentia quorum esse jubebatur *κακὸς ἄγγελος*. But although מַר is

[1] Tübingen, Zeitschrift, 1840. 1 H. s. 134, 138.

[2] Plinius. hist. nat. 37: 15, duritia inenarrabilis est. cf. Winer. Realwörterbuch, I. s. 333 ff.

used to denote the emotion of anger as a painful one, yet this is decidedly contrary to the constant meaning of חֵמָה which never stands for pain or sorrow, but only for wrath, and by which in the present instance the meaning of מַר is more definitely determined. For this reason a return to the former weakness and despondency, 2: 1, cannot here be supposed. What, then, are we to think of the sadness and anger of the prophet? Some may lay stress upon רוּחִי as if the prophet opposed his own spirit, his natural consciousness to the Divine Spirit, to the Divine influences, which were working in his soul. This has Calvin especially very beautifully set forth: videtur tacita esse antithesis inter motum illum quo abreptus erat, et inter affectum non quidem prorsus vitiosum, sed qui aliquantum distaret a gratia illa spiritus; quia propheta sic flagrabat zelo, ut fere sui oblitus Dei jussa capesseret. We may well suppose such a disposition to have been in the prophet after the foregoing description of Israel's relation to his God; now in the moment that he is about to acquit himself of his commission to his people, an indignation overpowers him which needs to be sanctified from above in order not to result in decided transgression. But I confess, that it seems to me this thought must then have been otherwise expressed. The word חֵמָה especially appears strange. For whenever merely natural, human and unholy displeasure or anger is spoken of, the Hebrews use חָרָה, cf. Jon. 4: 1. 4: 9, and the many places noticed by Gesenius thes. 2, p. 518. Also here we should certainly then read וַיִּחַר לוֹ. On the other hand, Michaelis with true discrimination has defined חֵמָה: nobilis irae nomen, cum fortitudine conjunctae. This is confirmed by constant Hebrew usage, by etymology, as also by kindred words in Arabic. We therefore take the word in its good sense and compare parallel passages, as Jer. 6: 11, "I am full of the fury of the Lord." Especially Jer. 15: 17, "Because of thy hand (the hand of Jehovah upon the prophet) I sat alone; for thou hast filled me with indignation." It is with Ezekiel as with his contemporary Jeremiah. He, also, in view of the apostasy of the people and the punitive judgments which they deserve, is filled with a holy indignation, that deep emotion united with clear knowledge such as also the New Testament everywhere approves of;[1] for God himself has opened the eye of his Spirit to see the exceeding wickedness of the people and called him to be a herald of judgment; and the seer powerfully feels the hand of Jehovah, the inner movement of the Spirit impelling him to speak the word of the Lord, and which would not suffer him to rest till he had fulfilled the Divine commission.

V. 15. מַשְׁמִים — וְאֵשֵׁב = וְאָשְׁבָה מְשׁוֹמֵם, Ezra 9: 3, 4. מַשְׁמִים,

[1] Vid. Tholuck Commentar zur Bergpredigt s. 171.

literally, one who keeps silence, thence, one who has no intercourse with others, solitary. To sit on the ground, especially to sit in solitude and silence was a sign of sorrow, Job. 2: 13. Lam. 1: 1. 3: 28. cf. also Jer, 15: 17. *Seven days* was the usual time of mourning, Job 2: 13. As Jeremiah, 7: 29 sq., received the direction to put on the deepest mourning and to sound a dirge over his unhappy country, so we see Ezekiel from the outset a mourner, as suited to the purport of the message which he was to communicate. So ought the people in like manner to sit down in penitent sorrow and humiliation before God, but their representative, the solitary servant of God is a sign, how forgetful the multitude around him are of God, and also how just are the judgments of God which are coming upon them. The outward appearance of the prophet was, accordingly, an announcement of something extraordinary, and was a signal to his contemporaries, that by his mouth Jehovah would make known what he purposed concerning Israel.

[We subjoin a few notes upon the symbolic character of the vision of Ezekiel from Hitzig's commentary. *Der Prophet Ezechiel, erklärt von Dr. Ferdinand Hitzig, Professor der Theologie in Zürich. Leipzig*, 1847.]

In the description of the theophany, the most prominent point seems to be the fourfold division which is carried through so far as possible, and the most significant application of which is, doubtless, to the faces of the cherubim. Each cherub had four faces. They looked towards the four quarters of the world. In the vision of Isaiah the faces of the seraphim were covered, Is. 6: 2. In the vision of Ezekiel, two wings covered the bodies of the cherubim as a token of reverence, but their faces were not allowed to be covered. Why now must the cherubim look at the same time towards the four quarters of the world? Why are they not permitted to turn round? The matter is plain, if it is meant to be expressed thereby, that God has everything before him; that for him there is no backwards and no forwards. In fact the symbolic character of these creations admits of no doubt. The composition of their forms proves it. Since they never in real life offer themselves to our perception, Ezekiel must have intended by such an image to have expressed an idea; and what is this idea? The cherubim belong to the immediate environment of God, are as it were brought close to his throne; they seem, therefore, to stand in a relation to the idea of God, and to receive their form from

it, as truly as the lions by the throne of Solomon, 1 Kings 10: 19, 20, are symbols of dominion, i. e. of the attributes belonging to the king. Since moreover each cherub has four faces, he sees, even as God does, both *πρόσσω καὶ ὀπίσσω*, is consequently participant of a specific Divine attribute; and it is highly probable that to denote this idea four faces are given to him. For this purpose, however, four faces of the same kind would be sufficient, but they are of different and specified creatures. That their selection was made with special reference to the idea of God, is in itself probable, and becomes certain, if without constraint they may be shown to signify attributes of God.

If we examine the modes of expression in the Old Testament, the symbols, lion and eagle, are readily explained. The former is undoubtedly an image of the authority and dominion of God as resting upon surpassing strength, Prov. 30: 30. 19: 12. 20: 2. Hos. 11: 10. Amos 3: 8. Jer. 49: 19. The eagle is either an expression of a careful and loving Providence, as Deut. 32: 11. cf. Ex. 19: 2, or rather, since this is less an attribute than an outflow of one, and is limited to Israel, a symbol of perennial life, of eternal youth, Ps. 103: 5. As seeing into the distance, Job 39: 29. cf 28: 7, the eagle never serves to symbolize the all-seeing eye of God; and as king of birds, as symbol of authority,—Ezek. 17: 3 sq., is no proof—he is foreign to the Old Testament. Man might symbolize the power of God, cf. Gen. 1: 28. 9: 2. Ps. 8: 6, but most probably each face of the cherub has a special meaning. The human face here signifies the intelligence of God. Prov. 30: 2. Job 32: 8. Dan. 7: 4. The ox, finally, Ezekiel might have known as a symbol of Jehovah from the Egyptian idolatry. There, as well as in the service of Siva, the steer was a symbol of generation, and accordingly of creation. But perhaps Moloch not only in Carthage and Crete, but also in Phœnicia and Ammon, bore the head of an ox, and thus the face of an ox in the image of Ezekiel might symbolize annihilating power. Jehovah would thereby be denoted as one who killeth and maketh alive, 1 Sam. 2: 6, as Creator and Destroyer; by the other symbols, as the Eternal, or as the Provider and Preserver, vid. e. g. Ps. 65: 10 sq. 36: 6. Job 38: 39—41, and as searching in understanding and mighty in power, Job 9: 4. 12: 13. Is. 40: 26.

ARTICLE VII.

NEW EDITION OF PLUTARCH'S LIVES.

Plutarchi vitae parallelae ex recensione Caroli Sintenis. [In four vols. 8vo.; vol. 1 appeared in 1839; vol. 2 in 1841; vol. 3 in 1843; vol. 4 in 1846.]

This is the first edition of Plutarch's Lives, founded on new examinations of manuscripts, since the year 1572, (when H. Stephens' edition in 13 vols. 8vo. was published at Geneva,) if we except Bryan's (London, 1723—29), completed after his death by Moses Solanus or de Soul. Reiske (Leipzig, 12 vols. 8vo. 1774—1782) and Hutten (Tübingen, 14 vols. 8vo. 1795—1805), in their editions of the entire works of Plutarch had no new manuscript aid; and the same may be said of Coray's (Paris, 6 vols. 8vo. 1809—1815) and Schaefer's (Leipzig, 6 vols. 12mo. 1825—1830) valuable editions of the Lives.

Meanwhile several German scholars were beginning to call attention to Plutarch's Lives by careful editions of one or more of them with or without manuscript assistance. Among these we name Bähr of Heidelberg who published in 1822 the Life of Alcibiades, and in 1826 the Lives of Philopoemen, Flaminius and Pyrrhus; Held of Sulzbach (Aemilius Paulus and Timoleon, 1832), Vögelin of Zürich (Brutus, 1833), Schoemann of Greifswald (Agis and Cleomenes, 1839), Kraner (Phocion, 1840), Westermann of Leipzig (Solon, 1841), and Sintenis himself, who is, we believe, a gymnasial professor at Zerbst, in Anhalt-Dessau; and who by his Themistocles (1832) and Pericles (1835) gave decisive proof of his judgment and ability.

Sintenis came to his task of preparing a critical edition of all the Lives, aided by important collations of Paris manuscripts which Bähr and Held had set on foot as well as by readings of a Munich manuscript received from Goeller, and of Palatine manuscripts examined by himself. Before his work had reached its close in 1846, he obtained from several quarters, especially from Paris, valuable additional readings which are given in the addenda to the fourth volume. Hence it will be obvious that no one has been able to determine the text of Plutarch as well as Sintenis; and we apprehend that the judgment of scholars will accord him high praise for the execution of his task.

Those critics who have given their attention to the text of Plutarch have found it difficult to decide respecting the merits of the edition of H. Stephanus. This great scholar, after the fashion of his time, was careless in giving the authorities for his emendations; so that without new examinations of manuscripts it could not be said whether he followed his own taste and knowledge of Greek, when he departed from earlier editions, or whether he had readings from uncollated manuscripts. Wyttenbach's judgment, although he attributes to Stephanus great license in altering the text without authority, is not severe. He frees him from the charge of bad faith and fraud which many modern scholars have laid upon him; and attributes to haste and to the custom of the age, by which conjectures and the readings of manuscripts were held in equal respect, whatever in his treatment of Plutarch's text tends to throw a shade upon his reputation. Sintenis however is not so lenient. We will give his own words in his preface spoken with reference to an assertion of Stephanus, that he had forborne to follow his own conjectures, and had obeyed the manuscripts throughout,—an assertion by the way which Wyttenbach seems to have overlooked. "Admirabuntur," says Sintenis, "hanc tanti viri modestiam, qui verbis fidem habere assueti, Plutarcheam Stephani operam usu cognitam non habent, praedicabuntque tanto magis, quo pejus coepit nostrorum hominum audire in hoc genere temeritas: sed qui ipsi causas quae aguntur explorare didicerunt, nec idoneo scriptoris usu destituti sunt, non poterunt non suspectissimam habere Stephani fidem talia jactantis de sua in ea re modestia alia autem omnia agentis. Nam qui aliquam in Plutarcho posuerunt operam uno ore confessi sunt omnes, quas Stephanus multis locis adhibuisset correctiones non ex libris petitas sed ab ipso excogitatas esse, cujus rei argumenta certissima ex ipsarum correctionum indole petere licet cuivis sermonis Plutarchei non plane ignaro."

This charge against the great printer-critic carries on its face the air of improbability. That he should have appropriated the labors of others without acknowledgment, which he is accused of doing in his edition of Plato, is not incredible; but what motive was there for passing off his own conjectures as manuscript readings, when nobody cared whether his emendations sprung from the one source or from the other. One would think that the temptation lay on the other side; that the desire to gain applause by seeming conjectures, really founded on the manuscripts, would have led a man of bad faith to suppress his authorities and shine in borrowed plumes.

It is one of the 'curiosities of literature' that after three hundred years the character of this eminent scholar has, as it respects Plu-

tarch's Lives, been vindicated and proved to be immaculate by the very man whose aspersions we have quoted above; that the often repeated charges against Stephanus have been shown to have emanated from the sluggish ignorance of editors who propped themselves up by the unexamined opinions of their predecessors; and that the new readings from Paris manuscripts, which appear at the beginning of Sintenis's fourth volume prove Stephanus to have neither received into his text, nor mentioned in his notes other readings which were not drawn from manuscript sources. Sintenis has taken occasion in two places to atone for the injury which he did in his preface to the memory of his predecessor in the criticism of Plutarch; he has done so in the preface to his fourth volume, and also in the first number of the Philologus edited by Scheidewin of Göttingen (pp. 134—143). In this magazine he speaks as follows: "da mir die Lesarten der Pariser Handschriften vollständig vorliegen, kann ich versichern dass nur wenige stelle übrig bleiben, wo die Lesarten, welche Stephanus entweder stillschweigend in den text gesetzt oder mit Erklärung versehen hat dass sie handschriftliche seien, nicht in einer oder der andern Pariser Handschrift sich fänden. Dass aber auch für diese verhältniss-mässig wenigen stellen eine Benutzung bis jetzt unbekannter oder verloren gegangener Handschriften angenommen werden müsse, scheint zwingende folge der gemachten Erfahrung zu sein."

Thus is Stephanus set right again before the present and future generations of scholars; and it is to be hoped that some one will be equally successful in clearing him from all blame in regard to the text of Plato. What Passow said of him years before this vindication from manuscripts was known, deserves to be inserted here, as the dictate of a generous mind bringing forward the best defence which was then possible. "He prized them [manuscripts] only that he might restore by their aid decidedly corrupt places, and was obliged, where they left him in the lurch, as frequently happened, to make use of his divining faculty in their stead, which he did often judiciously and with success. This, however, is the side on which the most frequent blame, the strongest reproaches have been directed against his editions, especially against those of Plato and Plutarch; the charge being brought against him not only of haste and negligence, but also of consciously and purposely deceiving his readers as to the true origin of the readings he has adopted. To defend him on the first of these charges would be but vain painstaking. Stephanus must have renounced the activity which had become to him a second nature, if he would have toiled with that carefulness, going into all the minutiae of language which has made the name of his excellent contemporary Frederick

Sylburgius almost proverbial. Intentional dishonesty, however, lay so far from his whole way of thinking and feeling, that to defend him against such a charge in literary matters would be an insult."

At the close of his fourth volume, Sintenis inserts a letter of about forty pages in length, addressed to Prof. Sauppe, then of Zürich, but now, we believe, of Jena, and relating to the practice of Plutarch in his Lives with regard to hiatus. In this letter he avows himself an unwilling convert, as far as his author is concerned, to Benseler's doctrine that the dislike of the hiatus which Isocrates shows in his writings was shared by other later writers; as the orators Polybius, Plutarch, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus. If this can be proved in the case of any Greek author, it manifestly offers an occasion for conjectural emendation, and also puts a check upon it; for on the one hand the occurrence of hiatus will throw some suspicion upon the words in the sentence or upon their order of arrangement, while on the other it will be unlawful to propose emendations which contain an inadmissible hiatus. In his remarks Sintenis confines himself to the concourse of vowels in two words where either or both of them are long, reserving his opinion respecting the concourse of two short vowels for another occasion. He allows likewise to Plutarch more liberty than Isocrates retained; he is not offended by the forms of the article, by prepositions, by *καί*, by numerals, nor by words forming together one notion when they make hiatus; and a pause likewise excuses this freedom in his estimation.[1] The heads of proof that Plutarch did accommodate his style to the rhetorical rules of Isocrates are chiefly these:

1. The passages where hiatus occur, if compared with those of writers before Isocrates, as Xenophon and Thucydides, are very few. Three or four pages of these two last named authors or of Plato will contain about as many examples as the first six Lives of Plutarch. This contrast is rendered highly striking when passages from other authors who overlooked hiatus are quoted by Plutarch. In a law of Solon's, consisting of four lines only, there are more hiatuses than in the entire Lives of Solon and Poplicola.

2. Of the instances of hiatus in Plutarch many are corrected by the new readings. Thus of the forty-six occurring in the first six Lives, the manuscripts supply the correction for twenty-one. Now since this aid against hiatus is furnished by manuscripts neither very old, except the Sangermain one, nor very good, what might we not expect, asks Sintenis, if older and better books were at hand?

[1] Sintenis is inclined to a freer use of interpunctions than some other editors. In consequence of his views in this respect, a number of hiatuses have the ban taken off from them.

3. To these proofs it may be added that the free and loose collocation of words, which some attribute to negligence in Plutarch, is in part due to the desire of avoiding hiatus, and that we may ascribe to the same origin the use of compound words, where simple ones would have been chosen by good writers of the older times.

It is impossible to give these arguments their due weight without an extended examination of Plutarch's text particularly, as compared with the text of some author who flourished before the times of Isocrates. Sintenis takes the lives of Numa, Timoleon and Paulus Aemilius as touchstones of his theory; in the former, all the hiatuses of the wrong kind except one are removed by good manuscripts, or are found in passages suspicious for other reasons besides the occurrence of hiatus in them; and that one is removed by an elegant and almost certain emendation. As for the two other lives we will quote the words of Sintenis: "Ego quidem, quum reputo quam sint rara in conjunctis Timoleontis at Aemilii vitis hiatuum vestigia, ut quaevis Thucydidis, Platonis, Xenophontis pagina plures habeat, quam denique suspecta omnia, alia propter aliam causam, nihil habeo quod in hoc genere cum Plutarcheis comparare possim nisi Isocratea."

After the number of passages containing hiatus is thus materially reduced by the aid of the manuscripts, it becomes an easy task to emend most of the remaining ones; and the great machine for so doing is to change the collocation of words. The right to do this may fairly be conceded to the critic; still it may be asked, in regard to all such passages, whether they may not have escaped from a writer contrary to his usual rule. Is it possible for the most careful writer, who composes as many works as we have from Plutarch's hand, to be ever awake to such petty solicitudes as that in regard to the hiatus; nay, must not the presence of more than usual earnestness or manly purpose in writing call his attention away to better and higher things? However, then, the ear of Plutarch may have been trained to dislike the hiatus—the proof of which is furnished with great ability by Sintenis—we are prepared by such general considerations to look for exceptions; although, we confess, that fewer instances remain after the present editor's criticisms than we could have supposed.

From all that has been said it may be gathered that a new era has begun as to the text of Plutarch's Lives, and that they have found a most careful, thorough and sagacious editor. T. D. W.

Yale College.

ARTICLE VIII.

SCHOTT'S TREATISE ON THE STRUCTURE OF A SERMON.

By Edwards A. Park, Professor at Andover.

[In the Bibliotheca Sacra, Vol. II. pp. 12 seq. was given an Abstract of the First Part of Schott's Theorie der Beredsamkeit. In the Bibliotheca Sacra, Vol. III. pp. 461 seq. was given an Abstract of the Second Part of the same work. The First Division of the Third Part is condensed into the present Article. Its German title is: Theorie der rednerischen Anordnung, mit besonderer Anwendung auf die geistliche Rede. It occupies 254 pages of the third volume of Schott's entire treatise.]

1. *Importance of a regular Plan for a Sermon.*

The constructing of a good plan for a discourse requires not merely a general, but also a minute, thorough, profound acquaintance with the subject to which the discourse is devoted. Hence the want of a complete mastery over the theme is a frequent cause of the failure in the plan of presenting it, (and the search for an apposite *order* of the thoughts is a valuable means of suggesting the right thoughts themselves). As the sermon is designed to bring the hearers into entire sympathy with the preacher, it must exhibit that arrangement of ideas which can be most easily followed. As the preacher is engaged in an important colloquy with his hearers, he must follow it up on his part in a direct and an intelligible method. This method is useful, first to him in preparing his address, and secondly to them in understanding it. He must pursue a business-like course, going straightforward to his object; and this is *method.* He must adopt the order of *progress*, of advancement from the less to the greater; for it is a rule in aesthetics as well as morals, that there should be a uniform improvement, and that the last should be the best. He must also adhere constantly and perseveringly to this progressive plan; for it is equally a rule both of rhetoric and of morals, that there be no deviation from the right course, no averting of the aim from the best object of pursuit. The instant that a hearer fails to see the design of a remark, he fails of the requisite union between himself and the speaker. The demand

made upon the orator is, that he first enlighten and convince his audience; and he cannot fulfil this demand by barely presenting ideas; he must present them in the fitting relation to one another. He must next enkindle the imagination, arouse the feelings, and persuade the will; and must exercise no little sagacity in determining the order in which he shall address these different parts of our constitution. He is not exclusively to pursue the method of logic, but also that of an enlarged psychology. He is to consult all the principles of our nature, and to adapt his discourse to them according to the plan which is suggested by an extensive acquaintance with mental and moral science, and with the peculiar characteristics of his own auditory.

2. *Remarks on the different Kinds of the Introduction.*

A discourse may be divided into three general parts; the Introduction, the Prosecution of the subject and the Conclusion, (beginning, middle and end). By the old writers on homiletics the introduction was distinguished into three kinds: the *Exordium generale*, which preceded the reading of the text; the *Exordium speciale*, which exhibited the transition from the text to the theme; and the *Exordium specialissimum*, which followed the announcement of the subject and prepared the way for the body of the discourse. According to the Greek and Latin rhetoricians, the introduction is that part of a discourse which is designed *auditorem attentum, docilem, benevolum reddere.* All that part of the sermon, then, which is intended to prepare the hearers for the body of the sermon, by bringing them into the same circle of ideas, and into sympathy of feeling with the speaker, is the introduction. The ancient distinction between the exordium and the narratio facti, however appropriate to the Greek and Latin oration, is less proper for the sermon; but here the narration or explanation, instead of being a part distinct by itself, is involved in one of the other parts, the exordium, or the prosecution of the subject, or in a subordinate part, the transition from the text to the theme. Equally improper for the sermon is another distinction of the ancient rhetoricians, between the exordium in the restricted sense or the direct exordium (*principium*), and the indirect or the insinuating exordium (*insinuatio*, ἔφοδος). The latter is the style of introduction which an orator adopts when he fears to present his subject directly to his hearers because they are prejudiced against it, and he therefore conceals for a time his real design, assumes the appearance of intending to speak on a different theme, and after having thus secured their attention and engaged their interest in himself, he comes in a circuit unforeseen by

them to the real subject of the oration. In the process of this insinuating exordium he adopts the various arts of the *captatio benevolentiae*, to disarm his hearers of their hostile prepossessions and to ingratiate his subject into their favor. Thus Cicero, in his second Oration on the Agrarian Law, designed to oppose the division of lands among the people, but in order to preclude the selfish prejudices of those who were hoping to gain something by this distribution of the public property, he began by acknowledging his obligations to the Roman people, declaring his hearty love for them and his resolution to remain a *consul popularis;* and having thus prepared the way, he at length avowed that because he was determined to protect the interests of the people, he would not approve the Agrarian Law. In deliberative orations, where the spirit of party, where strong personal predilections and selfish passions are to be made subservient to the orator, he may avail himself of these circuitous and insinuating introductions. But in the calm sphere of pulpit eloquence, the noble object of which is to merge all individual interests into the common good, and persuade the will to virtue by the elevating and purifying motives of Christianity, all these artifices are needless and inappropriate. They are dissonant from the simple and honest spirit of the religion of Jesus. The preacher should indeed employ a manly wisdom in regulating the prepossessions and caprices which may obstruct the influence of his address, but he should take a direct and straight-forward way to this desirable end, and have no fellowship with works of darkness.

As the ancient rhetoricians distinguished between the exordium and the narration, they did not regard the former as an essential or even an important part of every discourse, but allowed it to be dispensed with frequently. The subject of the deliberative or judicial oration having been previously known to the hearers, and their minds having been prepared for it before they listened to the orator, he might often with perfect safety proceed at once *in mediam rem;* see Cicero pro Cluentio. Neither the ancient nor the modern preachers have uniformly adhered to the practice of beginning their discourses with the technical exordium. Where their themes are previously and favorably known to the hearer, there is the less need of technically *introducing* them. The homily, much more frequently than the regular sermon, may dispense with the exordium, for it is a loose composition, and does not require the artistic method. Still the homily should have one prominent train of thought, and the audience may sometimes need to be prepared for it by remarks adapted to win their attention. So, too, where the general subject of the discourse is antecedently known to the hearers (as on feast-days, at funerals, etc.), they may

sometimes need to be prepared for the specific view of it which the preacher intends to present. The rule, then, is that ordinarily a sermon should begin with a train of thought fitted and designed to secure the hearer's continued interest in the theme; and this exordium may be more or less abridged, according to the degree in which the audience may require a stimulus to their attention. The services which precede the sermon may sometimes be a sufficient introduction to it. They may suggest its theme, and predispose the auditory to regard it with favor. Even the hymn sung immediately before the discourse may be a proper exordium, to which the discussion may be attached. Dräseke has a sermon on Night viewed as proclaiming the Divine character. The last stanza of the hymn sung immediately before the sermon is:

> As with the morning's glimmering ray
> Flows thy mild blessing from above,
> With deepened feeling may we say
> "Now and ever thou art Love."

Then the preacher breaks out in the first sentence of his discourse:— "That with such feelings toward the love of God we should once more come forth from the night which has covered us with its wings —what a gift is this, thou Dearest One!—what a rich enjoyment!"

3. *Subject-matter of the Introduction.*

The preceding remarks on the general design of the exordium suggest at once its subject-matter. First, it may detail such particular experiences and facts as are involved in, and thus suggest the general truth to be discussed. The mind is aroused by the process from the concrete to the abstract, from the near to the remote, from the premise to the consequence. Especial interest is imparted to the subject, when certain passing events which illustrate it are described in the exordium. Secondly, it may state the reasons which induce the preacher to select his particular theme, or to treat it in the particular manner which he intends. Cicero's oration for Archias has an exordium which illustrates this, and also the following remark. Thirdly, the introduction may contain personal references to the speaker, the hearers, the relation of the former to the latter, or to his theme. In adopting this *locus ex personis* there is indeed a danger of exhibiting the Ciceronian vanity, but if the preacher is a good man, he will accustom himself to separate his own personality from that of his hearers as little as possible, and to hold out his subject and not himself foremost to their view. He may therefore be trusted to make an

allusion to his own circumstances, whenever his good judgment decides that such an allusion is required by the necessities or expectations of his audience. In the first sermon which he preaches after his ordination, or after the confinement of a protracted sickness, or in his valedictory discourse, he may prudently introduce such allusions. Fourthly, the exordium may contain those general principles under which the particular doctrine of the discourse may be reduced, on which it is founded, or to which it has a near relation or resemblance. A view of the *connections* of a subject gives it additional distinctness and prominence, and thus elicits new regard. Fifthly, interest is not only excited by a comparison of the subject with similar themes, but also by a contrast of it with subjects dissimilar and opposed. A clear view of the opposition between one doctrine and others, removes many doubts and misconceptions with regard to it, and imparts that vividness of idea which is essential to an excitement of feeling. Sixthly, the exordium may be devoted to an exhibition of the meaning of the text, and of its relations to the theme of the discourse. This is especially proper when the text is read *before* the introduction. If the reading of the text be deferred to the close of the exordium, (as is customary in the German pulpit), then the development of the subject from the text constitutes a subordinate but distinct part of the sermon, and is called the *Transitus*. When the *Transitus* and the exordium both follow the text, they may be considered as forming a single part of the discourse, as uniting in a compound exordium. When these two parts are separated by the intervening text, they may still have the same influence on the sermon, but they have each a distinct designation. The preacher's own judgment must determine on the relative position of these different parts of the discourse. On festival-days, the exordium may be devoted to a description of the object of the solemnity.

4. *General Rules for the Introduction.*

Its style may be either enlivening, as when the preacher aims directly to awaken an interest in his theme; or didactic, as when he aims to secure attention by a distinct and accurate statement of the nature and relations of his subject. Often in order to enlist the feelings of an audience in favor of a doctrine, it is simply requisite to give them clear ideas of it.

It is an important rule, that the introduction should be studiously and precisely accommodated to the mental state in which a congregation may be supposed to be at the commencement of the discourse.

Hence it should be written in an interesting style; should be free from common, trite remarks; it should contain such pithy, racy sayings, such questions or antitheses as will fasten the hearers' attention upon the main theme, and excite an earnest desire to investigate it. Hence the preacher should avoid, in his exordium, any train of remark which would be as appropriate to other subjects as to that which he is to discuss. Thoughts which may be perfectly fitting for the body of the discourse, may be too lifeless for the exordium, not sufficiently original or uncommon. Vague, undiscriminating and monotonous introductions, the *loci communes* of the ancients, deaden rather than enliven the mind of the audience. This striking character of the exordium, however, should be carefully distinguished from an affected, paradoxical, strained, pompous style. The expressions, though original, should be natural, suggested spontaneously by an earnest meditation on the theme, and approved by a calm judgment. The preacher should remember that his own interest in his subject was not sudden and instantaneous, but rose by degrees; therefore he should not expect that his hearers will *enter* into the consideration of his subject with the same zeal which he has acquired by having *passed through* a prolonged study of it. They must observe the same law of gradation which he followed; and when he produces his discourse *anew* before them, it should be a *fac-simile* of the discourse as he produced it *originally* in his study. He should not attempt to make them leap up at once to the very summit of his excitement. *Neque est dubium*, says Cicero, de Orat., *quin exordium dicendi vehemens et pugnax non saepe esse debeat.* There are exceptions, however. Sometimes the occasion itself may have so animated the auditory, that the orator may break the silence by an impassioned appeal. Thus did Tully introduce his first oration against Catiline. Thus too may preachers, though less frequently than secular orators, begin their discourses with expressions of excited feelings. Particularly on festival days and other special occasions, may the preacher burst forth in a highly animated exordium; for then the audience are more ready to sympathise with him, their own religious feelings being more actively aroused, than on the ordinary services of the Sabbath. But these vivid exordia must not be protracted, and especial heed should be given to the easy and timely descent from their lofty sentiment to the calm spirit of the discussion. They cannot be long sustained by an audience; much less can they admit that law of gradation which should in general pervade the sermon, that regular increase of vivacity from the beginning to the end, which constitutes the climax of a discourse.

From the very nature of the exordium, we see at once that its con-

nection with the subject of the sermon should be plain and easy, not obscure or forced (exordium a causa separatum); that it should never suggest the question, how did the preacher find a passage from his first to his following remarks; that it should not anticipate the succeeding portions of the discourse, so as to diminish at length the feeling of progress and to require a repulsive repetition; that it should point so decidedly toward the real theme to be discussed as to raise no apprehension of a different one, and thus stimulate the audience on a false chase; that it should not always begin or end in the same style, but should be made attractive by its variety; that it should not be too long, and thus repress the zeal of the hearer to hasten toward the discussion. There is a just proportion to be exhibited between the different parts of a sermon; and the undue length of any part mars its beauty. If the lengthened exordium be interesting, it operates upon the hearer's mind as a counter force, diverting it from the discussion. It is like shedding a bright light on the back ground of a picture, and bringing the wrong objects into relief. Besides, a frequent result of a too long introduction is, too long a sermon. The shorter the exordium the better, if it omit nothing important for enlisting the feelings of the audience in favor of what is to follow.

For the observance of the above named rules it is requisite, that the introduction be not written until the whole discourse be minutely planned and its contents thoroughly understood. It is peculiarly important to begin the discourse correctly, because the hearers, not being then occupied with its main subject, are uncommonly sensitive to the faults which they then easily discover, and will be prejudiced by these foibles against the ensuing parts of the sermon.

5. *The Proposition.*

[In the German pulpit, the preacher frequently announces his text after he has closed his exordium, and then offers a short prayer, which constitutes part of the discourse itself. This prayer is occasionally offered in some other part of the sermon, and sometimes precedes the exordium.] After the prayer, the preacher should proceed as directly as possible to the proposition. This may be defined, the announcement of the subject of the discourse; or the sentence which definitely expresses the subject of the sermon. (Propositio, *πρόθεσις, πρότασις, προκατασκευή.* The same technical term is also sometimes used to denote the expression of the leading idea of some subordinate part of the sermon.) In secular oratory, the formal proposition may be occasionally dispensed with. Quinctilian recom-

mends this omission. Demosthenes sanctions it in his first Phillipic. So in "occasional" sermons, and in homilies, the preacher may omit the regular proposition, and may indicate his main theme by his modes of transition to it. But in his ordinary discourses, he should retain the formal proposition. The use of it gives definiteness and precision to the ideas of the audience; it excites their curiosity and stimulates them to attention. It is, moreover, so uniformly expected, that the want of it is thought to proceed from an immethodical spirit in the preacher, and thus prejudices the audience against his whole discourse. The rules for the proposition are, that it present the theme of the sermon in its requisite unity; that it be precise, perspicuous, and brief. It should be so expressed as to give no needless offence, but on the contrary to be as attractive as possible. Some pulpit orators possess the happy faculty of presenting condensed, sententious, suggestive propositions, which surprise the hearer and rivet his attention to the theme. Several of Dräseke's propositions are: "beware of a dry heart," from Ps. 32: 4; "the art of accomplishing much in life," from Mark 1: 32—39; "every church-day is a family-day of God," from Eph. 2: 19. Sometimes a stanza in a hymn is used for the proposition of the discourse. It suggests a definite idea to the mind, is associated with pleasant reminiscences, and is withal easily remembered. If, however, the stanza present the subject of the discourse in a figurative style, or if it present an outline of the whole sermon, it is not suitable for a proposition. In the latter case, it is better fitted for the partition. There is great danger that the search for striking expressions of a theme will lead to the selection of paradoxical statements, having the appearance without the reality of depth and compressed wisdom. In the use, too, of figurative propositions, there is danger of extending the figure too far. It may be judicious, for example, to draw a parallel between Christ and a shepherd, in a sermon from John 10: 1—12; but care must be taken not to run the parallel into the regions of the fanciful. Not every biblical comparison can be extended into an allegory in a modern sermon. The taste of the present age forbids it. The original comparison was not designed to be, and cannot with propriety be applied to more than one or two points; and the attempt to multiply the resemblances leads to visionary and perhaps disgusting remarks. Even Dräseke has a sermon on Matt. 23: 37, in which he dilates on the similitude between the Saviour and a brooding hen! It is easy to see that a minute comparison between the last day and a thief in the night, would introduce many irrelevant, puerile remarks. Allegorical discourses are apt to be finical, undignified, unintelligible, even revolting.

One class of propositions consists in the mere name of the subject, either particular or general, simple or compound; either without a predicate, as, The conscience, or with a predicate, as, The reproving conscience; either without a precise designation of the train of thought to be pursued, as, The necessity of Solitude, or with such a designation, as, The necessity of solitude for acquiring self-knowledge. In proportion to the definiteness with which a particular train of thought is proposed at first, must be the limitation of the subsequent remarks to that specific train. A second class of propositions is expressed in a perfect sentence, and that either *categorical*, which must be afterwards proved, as, Faith without works is like a body without a soul; or *hypothetical*, which summons the hearers to answer a question, to investigate a subject or solve a problem, as, Does not the religion of Jesus demand too much of its followers? or, How significant of our moral state is our treatment of the Lord's supper. A third class consists in a combination of the first two classes, the proposition being the mere name of the theme, but containing all the parts of a perfect sentence, as, The experience that great improvement results from painful effort and harassing fears.

6. *The Transition.*

The *transitus* is ordinarily defined, as that part of the discourse which develops the connection between the theme and the text. It corresponds in some degree with the "narratio" of the ancient rhetoricians. It is not, however, the explanation of the text as such, but is that part of the explanation which is necessary for showing the pertinency of the proposition to the text, or the fact that the former is involved in the latter. If the proposition be derived directly and obviously from the text, it demands only a brief *transitus* which shall unfold the intermediate idea uniting the two; but if it be derived indirectly and by inference, it requires a more extended illustration of the process by which it is deduced from, and of its precise relevancy to the text. The shorter the transition so much the better, if it fully demonstrate the fitness of the theme to the words by which it was ostensibly suggested. If the transition be long, it has the appearance of a second exordium, [and this fault is somewhat common in those German discourses, in which the transition immediately follows, and the introduction directly precedes the text].

The term transition has often a more extended meaning than that above given, and includes every part of the discourse which develops the connection between two prominent trains of remark; the passage

from one head to another, the exhibition of an intermediate thought embracing part of the preceding and part of the following. The perfection of this branch of the sermon consists in its introducing the new topic easily, naturally, and giving it the appearance of growing out of the preceding stock, as a branch from the trunk. The common fault of sermons is, that the different topics are introduced abruptly, like the parts of a scientific treatise, or else the transitions are made with apparent artifice, and attract attention to themselves. The former fault diminishes the unity of the discourse as a whole; the latter diminishes its ease, simplicity, and modesty. Reinhard exhibits often a great degree of ease in his transitions, and so connects together the different parts of a discourse as to save them from a fragmentary, disjointed appearance, and to preserve the unbroken evenness of the whole. In a Fast-day sermon on the duties to which we should be excited by viewing the dignity of Christ's church, he occupies his first division with remarks illustrating this dignity, and slides into his second division by the following gradual descent.[1] "And it is hard to tear ourselves away from this elevating view, but we must come down to our own characters, and compare them with the image now presented of the Christian communion, and see whether we be like it. Let us then inquire, what duties are urged upon us by this view of the church's dignity. And oh! I must have had but little success in attempting to portray it, if it do not excite in our breasts, as the first feeling required of us, a reverential gratitude towards Jesus." Having thus glided into his second division and its first subdivision, he is led to close the latter with a prayer expressing thankfulness to Christ for having delivered the church from death, and he ends the prayer with the words: "And we, even we, are among the beings whom thou hast delivered; among the members of the communion which thou lovest! And yet, my brethren, can we, dare we say this? Are we justified in regarding ourselves as a part of the church whose dignity has been now described? Oh! a thoughtful examination of our spiritual state is doubtless the second thing demanded of us, in contemplating this exalted dignity." He is thus led to propound various questions for conducting this examination, and then naturally exclaims: "What questions! my brethren, what themes for us to examine! Yet why should I not speak boldly (in propounding them)? The more impartial our scrutiny of the matter, so much the more must a view of the dignity of the church fill us with deep shame for our delinquencies," and this is the third duty which the subject enjoins upon us, after considering which we are told as a matter of course:

* These extracts are abridged from the original.

"But in vain are such emotions, unless our views of the dignity which the church should possess, inspire us with the firm purpose of striving for it with increased earnestness." This effort, being the fourth duty enjoined, easily and without a chasm suggests the fifth, "that we cling to the gospel of Jesus as the means of attaining the exaltation which we should strive for," and the prospect of which prompts to all the duties which have been considered.

7. *The Partition.*

The Greek and Roman rhetoricians set a high value not merely on the early announcement of the entire theme of the discourse, but also on the early announcement of the leading ideas and general course of thought in the treatment of that theme. Hence they prescribed that the proposition (in its narrow sense) should be followed by the partition. According to the phraseology of Aristotle, the proposition includes the partition; according to that of Cicero, the partition includes the proposition. Quinctilian says: Partitio est nostrarum aut adversarii propositionum, aut utrarumque ordine collata enumeratio.[1] The discourse may be divided into the part addressed to the intellect and that addressed to the feelings; or into descriptions of the various attributes of the subject, or of its specific branches, or its subordinate relations to duty, etc., or its efficient or final causes; or into various processes of proof or of explanation, or into contrasted exhibitions of two opposing sides of the same subject.

The advantages of stating at the outset the more prominent topics of the discourse are, that thereby the attention of the audience is more closely fastened on the most essential parts of the theme, and these parts are more distinctly and more easily understood and remembered, not only in themselves but also in their relation to each other and to the entire discourse. Recte habita in causa partitio illustrem et perspicuam totam efficit orationem, says Cicero.[2] This preparatory sketch serves also to recommend the speaker as one who thinks logically, and who has with particular care and thoroughness investigated his present theme. It also relieves the tedium of the discourse for the hearers, by giving them waymarks which apprise them of the speaker's progress, by visibly changing the scene before them and refreshing them with a near view of the peroration. This advantage, however, was greater for the secular orations of antiquity than for the modern sermon; for those were much longer than this, and more fatiguing. Al-

[1] Inst. Orat. L. IV. c. 5.

[2] De Invent. L. I. c. 22.

though the abovenamed advantages are real, yet they do not require the uniform insertion of this preparatory outline. The sermon should, and often may be planned with such discrimination, written with such accuracy and distinctness, spoken with such variety of emphasis, that it shall not require the aid of a preparatory sketch, in order to make and keep an audience attentive to the thoughts, their reciprocal relation, the exact order of their arrangement. Moreover, it is not necessary that the hearers be able always to repeat the thoughts of the discourse consecutively. Few can remember their exact order, even if it be at the first distinctively announced. The design of the discourse is accomplished, if the audience fully understand its genius and main import, become interested in it, and inspirited by it to a virtuous life. Neither the ancient nor the modern pulpit orators have confined themselves to the use of the partition.

When it is employed, however, it should be free from all that is obscure, verbose, artificial or highly adorned. By its compressed, suggestive, nervous, energetic style it should stimulate the curiosity of the hearers. Harms has a sermon with this proposition: Do right and fear no man; and with the following partition: This proverb is, a word of instruction, a word full of power, a word of consolation; or a proverb for thought, strength and solace. He has another sermon on Death in life, with this easily remembered partition:

1. Ihr selber seid ein fallend Laub;
2. Und, was ihr thut, zerfällt in Staub;
3. Und, was ihr habt, wird Todes-raub.[1]

The partition should be conformed to the rules of logic. Thus do logic and rhetoric embrace in part the same sphere. The feelings cannot be aroused unless the judgment be first convinced, and the judgment cannot be convinced unless the arguments be presented to it in a manner consentaneous with the laws of mind, and this manner is first prescribed by logic for the discovery of truth, and then adopted by rhetoric for the communication of it. The discourse being a dialogue between the speaker and the minds of his audience, must go on in the straight line which the mental laws require, and any in-

[1] Many of the German preachers are fond of introducing the paronomasia into their divisions, for the purpose of aiding the memory of the hearers. Thus Tholuck in his 2nd volume of Sermons, p. 124, says, "The quickening thoughts to which this narration leads us, are the following:

1. Die Stätte seines *Scheidens*, die Stätte seines *Leidens;*
2. Verhüllet ist sein *Anfang*, verhüllet ist sein *Ausgang;*
3. Der *Schluss* von seinen *Wegen* ist für die seinen *Segen;*
4. Er ist von uns *geschieden* und ist uns doch *geblieben;*
5. Er bleibt *verhüllt* den Seinen, bis er wird *klar erscheinen.*"

terruption of the train of thought breaks up the interest of the hearers in the dialogue. There are instances, however, in which the rules of rhetoric require an exception from the rules of logic. Thus, when a genus is the theme of the discourse, logic would require that all its species, however unimportant, be introduced as parts of the division, but rhetoric may simply require that the essential characteristics of the genus be introduced, and these constitute the partition, as technically distinct from the division. Again, it is a logical rule that no single branch of the partition shall be identical with the proposition itself, and that substantially the same sentence which constitutes a chief head of the discourse, shall not reäppear as one of the subordinate heads. The mind of the audience is interrupted in its progress from premises to results, by this appearance of repetition. The speaker is very apt to commit this fault by expressing his proposition too indefinitely, and by subsequently introducing heads of discourse which he had not at first designed to mention. Reinhard has a sermon with the theme, Warnings against a morbid Conscientiousness; and he first explains the nature of the fault; secondly, describes the signs and the workings of it; thirdly, states the reasons why we should guard against it. Now this third branch of the partition is the same in substance with the original theme, and the first two branches are not logically appropriate as parts of the proposition, but are presupposed by it. This reäppearance of the proposition, after other heads have been discussed, might have been avoided by giving it a more general form; as for instance, Morbid conscientiousness, under which the abovenamed partition would be logically appropriate. This general theme, however, would excite the expectation of a merely intellectual treatise, and Reinhard designs to give a practical character, and the appearance of it, to his sermon. The relation of his discourse to the will is indicated in his proposition, and thus do the laws of rhetoric allow, and in some cases even require this prominence of the persuasive influence over the logical exactness of the arrangement.

As the whole proposition should not be repeated in any one of the subordinate heads, so it should contain, in itself, all the ideas and none other than the identical ideas, which constitute the various branches of the partition. When the practical character of the discourse will not allow the preacher to treat thoroughly of his entire subject, he should either limit his proposition so as to cover no more ground than he designs to travel over, or else should inform his hearers that he intends to discuss a part only of the proposed theme. As the sentence announcing the subject of discourse should not be the same with any of the subordinate heads, so these subordinate heads, whether *partes* or *sub-*

partes, should never repeat but mutually exclude each other; and there should be no mingling of their various classes, no arranging of the species and proper subdivisions in the same rank with the genus and the proper divisions. This is the general rule; but when the proper subdivisions are of great practical importance, they may, by rhetorical license, be elevated to the same rank with the proper divisions. For example, The conscious effort to live a holy life benefits the soul; first, by revealing to it its moral imperfections and thus assuaging its restlessness; secondly, by comforting it amid the trials of life and at the hour of death; thirdly, by securing treasures for it in the life to come. Now the logical partition of this theme would be: The conscious effort for holiness benefits the soul, first in this life, secondly in the life to come. But the blessings of this life are divided, in the rhetorical arrangement, into two species, constituting the first and second heads, and these are arranged in the same class with the genus, comprising the blessings of the future state, and constituting the third head. The practical importance of considering, with marked attention, these two species, is a valid reason for giving them this illogical prominence.

In order to promote the perspicuity and strength of a discourse, it is necessary that its parts be so arranged as to make the preceding prepare the way for the succeeding, and the whole discourse rise in a gradation, from the less important to the more important. The topics which interest the intellect alone, should precede those which excite the imagination also and the feelings; and those which animate the lower sensibilities, should come before those which stimulate the higher. So the least cogent arguments should precede the more forcible, and thus allow the latter to exert an influence which no subsequent considerations will diminish. If the weaker arguments come last, they will efface somewhat of the impression produced by the stronger. It was recommended by the ancient rhetoricians, that one part of the arguments be placed at the beginning of the discourse, so as to make the first impression a strong one; that another part be placed at the close, so as to make the final impression strong also; and hence that the weaker arguments be placed in the middle, where they will be in some measure hidden from view. This arrangement was compared to the disposing of the forces of an army, so as to place the most inefficient troops in the centre, and to surround them with the bravest: Iliad, Book IV. v. 297 seq. But Quinctilian justly doubts the uniform propriety of this rule, and prefers that the arguments be arranged according to circumstances, but always *ne a potentissimis ad levissima decrescat oratio.* The secular eloquence of Greece and Rome allowed

the introduction of reasoning processes which were designed merely to deceive, and therefore were to be so placed as to elude the scrutiny of the judges. But sacred eloquence, excluding all proofs which are merely apparent and deceptive, requires that the thoughts which make the deepest impression on the mind of the speaker, and which will therefore be uttered with the greatest earnestness and listened to with the most profound attention, be so placed as to cause the hearers to rise, with the preacher, in a regular climax. Hence the arguments from reason should precede those from Scripture. On the same principle, the objections against the proposition are to be introduced before the direct proof of it. Else they will confuse the mind, diminish its interest in the discussion, and prevent the due influence of the positive argument. First, the hearers are to be convinced that the proposition *can* be true, and this is done by removing their previous objections; secondly, they are to be convinced that it *must* be true, and this is effected by the positive proof. In the arrangement of the objections, the strongest should be placed first, and the gradation should be regular from them to the weakest, and thus the way is prepared for the direct arguments. The same principle is to be observed in the arrangement of the explanatory heads. The most remote explanations should be placed first, and there should be a gradual progress, nearer and nearer to the full statement thus progressively explained. Hence negative heads are proper in a discourse, and should precede the positive.

It is an important rule that the partition be simple, that is, contain as few parts as the clearness of the investigation will allow. It can, however, be made too simple. Particulars may be reduced to such general propositions, that the whole discourse will be too abstract for the common mind; often, then, should the individual and concrete statement be preferred to a more comprehensive one, because it is better adapted to the imagination and the feelings. Reinhard has a sermon on the duty of those who are called to severe and mysterious afflictions. He might have adopted the simple division into the outward and inward duty, but he prefers a less general classification, and makes prominent the following obligations: first, such mourners should be earnest in thought; secondly, modest in their judgments; thirdly, submissive in their feelings; fourthly, conscientious in their actions; fifthly, cheerful in hope; and sixthly, holding fast upon him who, through the suffering of death, has been crowned of God with glory and honor. Such a plan is far more vivid, and leads to a more impassioned peroration than the simple and comprehensive one first mentioned.

In the search for the simplicity of a partition, writers are tempted to express their theme in a style so general as to require too great a number of subordinate heads. A sermon will not allow such a multiplicity of subdivisions as is proper for a scientific treatise. The evil of this extended dissection is not always removed by what is called the *symmetry* of a plan. This consists in making all the parts of the discourse equal to each other in length; each of the principal heads correspondent with every other in the number of its subordinate heads; and each class of the subordinate parts correspondent in its style and significancy with every other class. One partition, for example, may detail a certain number of the causes of a certain fault, and another partition the same number of the remedies for it, each remedy being applicable to the cause which numerically corresponds with it. This symmetry is made the more conspicuous by an exact resemblance or contrast in the phraseology of the partitions.[1] The pulpit affords far more license for such symmetrical arrangements, than was offered by the secular eloquence of antiquity, the latter being unequal to the former in subjecting the plan of the discourse to the choice of the orator. There is great danger, however, of making a sermon artificial by this search for evenly balanced partitions. The thought is often distorted for the sake of regularity in the style. The charm of variety is sacrificed to the uniform measure of the divisions and subdivisions. This measure may be allowed when and only when the true, harmonious presentation of the thought requires it. We should study the demands of the subject, and should comply with them rather than the stiff rules of rhetoricians. Quinctilian censures those, qui partitionem vetant ultra tres propositiones; and says, Hoc aut alio tamen numero velut lege non est alliganda (partitio), cum possit causa plures desiderare.[3]

8. *Conclusion.*

Cicero says of Pericles, "tantam in eo vim fuisse, ut in eorum mentibus qui audissent, quasi aculeos quosdam relinqueret."[3] True elo-

[1] Dräseke has a sermon with the following interrogative proposition: "Does not the religion of Jesus require too much of us?" and with the following responsive division: 1. It seems, indeed, to require too much, (a) when we consider its commands according to their letter and not according to their spirit; (b) when we make the conduct of the masses our standard of the capabilities of the race; (c) when our own failings cause us to distrust our moral faculties. 2. It does not seem to require too much, (a) when we consider the spirit of the commands; it cannot seem to require too much, for, (b) if so, it is not for man; and, (c) if so, it is not from God.

[2] Inst. Orat. L. IV. c. 5.

[3] Cic. De Oratore, L. 3. c. 34.

qence has its triumph in the epilogue or peroration. The total impression of the discourse does not, indeed, exclusively depend on the manner of ending it; for the power of the conclusion must be derived, in great measure, from the substance of what has preceded. All parts of the discourse should converge to the final impression; all should conspire to the end. Still, the mode of collecting the means of this final impression, and of bringing them to their designed result, has been considered by all rhetoricians as preëminently important. A failure here is an essential evil to the whole. If the conclusion be not intimately connected with the parts which have gone before it, the discourse will be offensive through want of an unbending adherence to one purpose. If the conclusion be deficient in liveliness and strength, the discourse offends against the law of gradation, which requires the preacher to ascend; and, as far as he is able, to take his hearers with him from one stage to a higher, until he reach the most elevated point in the peroration.

There are different methods in which he may gather up the influences of his discourse, and combine them in one predominant impression. Among these methods, the ancient orators attached a high value to the recapitulation. The Greek rhetoricians termed it *ἀνακεφαλαίωσις* or *ἐπάνοδος*. Cicero calls it "enumeratio, per quam res disperse et diffuse dictae unum in locum coguntur, et reminiscendi causa unum sub adspectum subjiciuntur."[1] It is not to be denied that an animated, compressed, forcible repetition of the most important parts of the discourse, such a repetition as will give to the hearer an instantaneous, a comprehensive, and an affecting view of the entire theme, such as shall present this theme in its just proportions, and give the needed prominence to its most essential parts; such as shall combine in itself all the power which has pervaded the preceding divisions, and unite in one focus their enlightening and warming rays, is an essential aid to the hearer's intellect, in particular to his memory, and is also a persuasive appeal to his will. Nothing can be more appropriate as the *finale* of a sermon. But when the recapitulation is introduced abruptly, without seeming to grow out of the body of the sermon, when it is loose instead of precise, diffuse instead of condensed, when it is dry, stiff, lifeless, calmly didactic rather than energetically persuasive, a mere and a cold repetition of preceding topics rather than a vital concentration of them, when it is uniformly introduced in the same style and wants that variety and versatility which the excited minds of the hearers require, then it defeats its own end, and is more proper for any other part of the sermon than

[1] De Inventione, L. 1. c. 52.

for the final part. When an orator aims to control the immediate action of his auditors, he may apply the most powerful stimulus by condensing all that he has said into a brief peroration, and thus bringing down his whole address suddenly and with its accumulated, compressed force upon their minds. What can exceed the effectiveness of Cicero's final summary in his orations for Archias, Cornelius Balbus, and Aulus Caecinas, and of the recapitulation of Demosthenes contra Leptinen.

Although the usages of the German pulpit make the recapitulation a regular, they do not make it a necessary mode of concluding a sermon. It is better fitted for the logical and systematic discourse than for the free homily, especially when this homily is upon an historical text or a parable. The more numerous and the more diversified are the topics of remark in a sermon, so much the more inappropriate is the recapitulation ; for it becomes so much the more deficient in unity and in brevity. Often it is requisite that the conclusion spring from the last head in the body of the discourse ; that the former be a fervid continuation of the latter, and of course that there be no part intervening like a recapitulation. The last topic in the body of such discourses is the result of all that has gone before, it renews and enlivens the impression of all, and renders any further repetition unnecessary. Sermons which pursue the *regressive* method,[1] often end their discussion with a topic which of itself involves the preceding heads, and cannot be wisely separated from the concluding appeal. It is a mistake to suppose that the main influence of a sermon as a whole, depends upon the final repeating of its leading ideas and the orderly arrangement of them in the hearer's memory. These ideas may have stamped their indelible impress on his mind, even if he cannot recollect them in their exact method. He may be affected by their substance, while he cannot recall them in their precise form. Their impression may have been already made upon his feelings, and his present state of emotion may be the whole result which the sermon was intended to produce. This result will not be increased, it may be diminished, by the formal recapitulation. Accordingly, the ancient orators do not uniformly repeat their leading ideas in their perorations : see Cicero, pro Ligario and pro Lege Manilia, and Demosthenes contra Midiam. Tzschirner has objected to Reinhard's sermons, because

[1] The *regressive* (analytic) method in a discourse, is that which goes backward from the sentiment of the text to the considerations which sustain or illustrate it; the *progressive* (synthetic) method is that which goes forward from the proofs or illustrations to the sentiment of the text; the *apagogic*, is that which proves the doctrine indirectly by showing the impossibility or absurdity of its opposite (reductio ad absurdum, or ad impossibile); the *ostensive*, is that which proves the doctrine directly by its appropriate arguments.

they too frequently terminate at the last head of the body of the discourse, without any regular peroration.

A tedious monotony, an abundance of idle, wearisome repetitions, and of artificial constructions, must result from an observance of the rule that every sermon shall close with a five-fold application—to instruct, to refute objections, to reprove or to warn, to exhort, and to console. The old writers of homiletics [English as well as German] insist on these five uses as essential to a profitable sermon: *usus didascalius* or *dogmaticus*, *elenchticus* or *polemicus*, *epanorthoticus*, *paeduticus*, *paracleticus*. They appeal to 2 Tim. 3: 16 and Rom. 15: 4, as if these passages were designed to supply clergymen with homiletical rules. But why should a preacher devote a special part of his sermon to each of these uses, when each may have been sufficiently attended to in his previous train of remark? Will it be said that he should systematically reserve all these applications for the close of his sermon, and therefore not insert them where they are logically appropriate? Shall the order of a discourse be thus invaded, and its whole shape distorted, for the sake of bending to an artificial and scholastic rule? And how shall every subject be made to suggest, naturally and without constraint, these five uses? It is a false view of the nature of a sermon, which induces its composer to abstain from all attempts to make it practical until he reaches the close of it. He should make it practical throughout, and as a whole.

Still, as some discourses are to be regulated by the theoretical proposition which is selected as their theme, these may properly defer until their close the most vehement or melting of their appeals to the heart and will. The conclusion of a sermon is often peculiarly fitted for delineating the practical results of a discussion, and for applying it to various classes of the audience. The final sentences of a discourse may very happily be one or more stanzas of a devotional hymn, or still more happily a passage of sacred writ. This is the most worthy top-stone of the whole structure. The echo of the sermon sounds so much the louder and deeper, by mingling it with the words of inspiration. Frequently this biblical and even the lyrical quotation may be the finishing words of a prayer with which the discourse closes. The excitement of the preacher rises higher and higher, until it can express itself only in the language of devotion. Both he and his hearers are more heartily interested in *concluding*, than they are in *beginning* their homiletical service with a prayer, although such a solemn address to God is an appropriate form for the commencement as well as for the termination of many a discourse. When this address is made the closing part of the sermon, it may breathe forth the emotions

which are naturally excited by the remarks which have been made, or it may express the personal hopes of the preacher that his discourse may be useful. He should give especial heed that it be animated with the spirit and be clothed in the language of supplication, and that it do not retain the prosaic character of the sermon. Reinhard sometimes inserts in his exordium a prayer which contains the division of his discourse, and sometimes the prayer in his epilogue is a virtual recapitulation of the leading ideas which he has advanced. The same may be said of other eminent preachers, and it cannot be indiscriminately condemned. The recapitulation may be expressed in such eminently devotional language, as to suggest no idea of a scholastic reference to the divisions in the sermon. Thus Herder, in his beautiful homily on the raising of the widow's only son from the dead at Nain, Luke 7: 11—17, expatiates on the providence of God that watches with fatherly care over the destiny of each individual, distributes and commingles joy and sorrow in a wonderful manner among men, sends helps and consolations at the very hour when they are most needed, not seldom in ways entirely unexpected, and most frequently by means of kind-hearted, compassionate men. He closes his discourse with the following recapitulatory yet affectionate prayer: "Oh thou who livest forever! thou Father of our destiny, before whose vision is stretched out the whole picture of our life with its sorrow and its joy; whose ear catcheth our cheerful and our mournful notes; in whose heart all our emotions resound! With a wise hand dost thou distribute joy and sorrow; thou troublest and consolest us, and teachest us thereby that we should comfort others. To all who are anxious and faint-hearted, give thou the inward assurance that thine eye seeth them, thy searching glance findeth them out, and thou hast compassion upon them. Let them hear the voice of thy Spirit speaking in their hearts, as none other can, and saying to them, Weep not!—and teach thou them to pray. At the right moment send thou the angel of consolation, who shall strengthen and quicken them with the cup of life. Awaken in men the noble sentiment, that they can be the very arm of the Most High, extending comfort and good cheer to the sorrowful. Lord! at that day when the last tears shall be wiped from our eyes, when thou by thy gentle power shalt raise us up to the higher life, when thine almighty hand shalt touch us and thou shalt say, I am he who liveth forever, and ye shall live also; oh, at that day, for all the events which have been intertwined with each other in our earthly course, for our mourning and our gladness, let there come into our eyes the tears of joy which are the thanks of the redeemed. Amen."

ARTICLE IX.

REMARKS ON THE CHINESE LANGUAGE.

Letter from an American Missionary in China.

You may perhaps be aware that the Chinese have selected from the whole number of the characters which compose their written language, two hundred and fourteen characters, called by them "Tsze-poo," and by us radicals, or keys, one or more of which constitutes, or forms a part of, every other character in the language. Each of these radicals is numbered and has its own proper name and place in native dictionaries. In their dictionaries the Chinese group together all the characters having the same radicals, and arrange these groups in the same numerical order with the radicals themselves. The characters under each radical are also arranged according to the number of strokes with the pencil which each character contains, not counting its radical. Thus a character composed of a radical and one stroke is placed first, that which has two strokes is placed next, and so on in regular order till the whole group is completed. In consulting their dictionaries, the Chinese first look for the radical belonging to the character, whose name or meaning, or both, they wish to learn, and then turn to the group of characters arranged under that radical and find it situated near or more distant from the radical, according to the number of strokes which it contains. Under this character thus found, is placed another character of the same sound, which is supposed to be known by the one who consults the dictionary, and which gives the name of the character sought. Then follow other characters of similar signification which give its meaning. This is the method of the Imperial Dictionary of Kanghe, which is the standard dictionary for the nation. In different parts of the empire, these characters, amounting to some 40,000, are called by different names, while their significations remain the same over the whole empire. Hence has arisen the great diversity of dialects among the Chinese, while the same characters and the same books are used with equal facility in every part of China. And here I would observe, by the way, that the difference of orthography used by missionaries in their communications, and in speaking of names and places here, arises mostly from the fact that some use them as they are heard or spoken in the local dialects, while others

conform to the orthography of the Mandarin, which is doubtless the most correct, and will probably, ere long, be universally adopted. Using this latter mode, one in speaking of this province would write its name Fukien, while another, using the orthography of one of the southern counties of this province, viz. Cheang Chew, would write it Hok Keen. So of most other names of men, places, etc., their orthography in different dialects differs more or less from their orthography in the Mandarin dialect.

Dr. Morrison selected from the whole number of Chinese characters, and such as were supposed to be in most common use, about 12,000, arranged them according to the radicals, and attached names and significations to them in English. Dr. Medhurst has done substantially the same thing, though in a much less extensive form, in respect to one of the county dialects of this province, viz. Cheang Chew. The missionaries at Canton have also furnished an English vocabulary, and a chrestomathy of the Canton dialect. Till recently we had to depend upon our teacher almost exclusively to give us the names of the characters in this dialect, but now, having constructed a syllabus of the dialect from a native vocabulary, and according to this written out the names of the characters contained in Dr. Morrison's list in English, we can, if we choose, be more independent of them in this respect. The native vocabulary above referred to contains a collection of several thousand characters, perhaps not less than ten, and those in most common use by the people of this city, arranged not according to the radicals, but according to the tones and the sounds of this dialect. It is called "Paĕk Ing," the eight sounds or tones, though there is in fact but seven tones in use, and comparatively only a few Chinese words represented by the same orthography in English, have as many as seven different tones. In the Mandarin, only four tones are usually spoken of, while in some of the provinces at least, as in this province, each of the above four tones has been divided into two, making in all eight, but in dividing one of the above tones, the distinction is lost and only one tone remains, thus making in all really but seven tones. Much has been said and written, and there still exists a great difference of opinion respecting the importance of the tones; one class making them of the highest importance and altogether indispensable in order to be understood by the people, while the other class regard a knowledge of them as useful though not indispensable, and as secondary to a correct and thorough knowledge of the character and idiom of the language. To say that such men as Dr. Morrison, Dr. Milne, and the late and much esteemed Mr. Lowrie, not to mention others still living and equally esteemed

for their learning and piety, to say that such men did not attain a sufficient knowledge of the language of China to appreciate the importance and nature of the tones, would be foolish and invidious in the extreme. How then are we to reconcile such a difference of opinion on this subject? It may be done in the way hinted at above, which is doubtless the correct way, viz. that in the Mandarin and in some other dialects, the tones are far less important than in others. In the Cheang Chew, Chwan Chew, Amoy and Fuh Chow dialects of this province, the tones are regarded by the people speaking these dialects, of special importance, while Chinamen speaking the Tie Chew, Canton and Ningpo dialects, seem to pay but little regard to them. The views of missionaries on this subject should of course be conformed to those of the people among whom they labor. It has been asserted, that the same characters have the same tones throughout the empire, how much soever they may differ in orthography in different places. This however is a mistake; it may be so generally, but it is far from being universal truth. And this is more generally true in respect to some tones than in respect to others. What is denominated the first tone may perhaps be so called throughout the empire, but the same cannot (probably) be truly said of any one of the other tones. The tones are classed or numbered differently in different dialects, *in respect to some words*, and *not so in respect to others*. For instance, in the Amoy dialect, the word for *tea* is ranged under the fifth tone, while here it is placed under the second tone; while the word for *man*, though spelt differently ("gin" at Amoy and "Ing" here Fuh Chow) is placed under the fifth tone in both dialects. So in the Cheang Chew dialect, some words which are there placed under the eighth tone are, in the Amoy, found under the fourth tone, while other words are placed under the same tone in both dialects. There is obviously a difference in the same tones as they are expressed by persons of different dialects, but this difference is of such a nature that it cannot be described on paper. Tone, according to Dr. Webster, means "sound, strength, accent," but as here used in respect to Chinese words, it has a different signification, inasmuch as words of the same orthography or sound have different tones, and accent has respect to other syllables, one or more, of which the word is composed, while the Chinese language is mostly monosyllabic and of course needs no such mark as accent, properly so called. Tone when applied to Chinese words, has respect to the manner of pronouncing monosyllabic words of the same orthography. Thus *sa*, the first tone, means west; *sá*, the second tone, means to wash, or bathe; while *sà*, the third tone, means small, diminutive. These three tones are all that are found

in connection with the word *sa*, in this dialect. Some words have more tones connected with them, and some have less, than the above. There is, however, no word of the same orthography in this dialect which has more than five tones connected with it, and only two or three which have as many as five, while the major part have from three to four. Some idea of the sounds of this dialect may be obtained from the initials and finals of the words of which it is composed. The initials are fifteen, and may be represented by the following letters of our alphabet, viz. l, p, k, k'h, t, p'h, t'h, ch, n, s, a, e, i, o, u, y, m, gn, ch'h, h. The character which stands for the preceding vowels, a, e, i, o, u, y, possesses much of the coalescing properties of the Aleph of the Hebrew, quiescing with the vowel sound of its final to which it is joined. The final sounds are thirty-three, as follows: ch'hung, hwa, heong, ch'hew, sang, k'hae, kah, ping, hwang, koe, sü, puy, koo, teng, kwong, hwuy, sew, güng, hong, che, teung, kaou, kwo, sa, keo, kea, seang, ch'hoey, ch'ha, t'heeng, keah, wae, keaou. The mode of joining these is to drop the sound of the first letter in the final, and place in its stead the sound of one of the initials. Thus the sound of Neung, in the colloquial of this dialect, signifies man, which sound is formed by dropping the sound of t in the final teung, and adding the initial sound of l, which forms the sound leung. The aspirated letters of the finals or their sounds are both dropped to receive the sounds of their initials. Thus *lae* signifies to come, and is formed from k'hae, by dropping the aspirated sound k'h, and prefixing the initial sound l, which makes lae, and so of all the other aspirated final sounds in the dialect. The Aleph of the Chinese, called Eng in this dialect, when standing alone but which coalesces with the vowel sound of its final in composition, follows the same rules as the above, both in respect to aspirated and unaspirated finals. For example, the sound of ae signifies to love, and is formed from the sound of the final k'hae, by dropping the k'h, and prefixing the Aleph character of Eng, which coalesces with the remaining vowel sound of k'hae and becomes ae.

The initial and final sounds joined as above described, contain, it is believed, all of the sounds in this dialect, excepting such of the fourth and eighth tones as end in a k sound. These two tones have perhaps as large a number of words under them as any other two tones in the dialect. They are formed by changing such of the finals as end in ng into the k sound in the fourth and eighth tones, called also the upper and lower entering tones. On this account it is not difficult for the ear to distinguish them from the other tones, but it is more difficult to distinguish them one from the other, as they both

have the same orthography and differ only in tone, which is the *manner* of pronouncing this orthography. Thus *hăk*, in the first entering tone signifies blindness, while *hàk* in the second or lower entering tone signifies agreement, concord, both being formed by changing the termination of the final sang into k, dropping the sound of the s and prefixing the initial h, which forms *hak*. In the same way, all of the finals ending in ng, in the fourth and eighth tones, change this termination into the k sound and receive as prefixes any of the above fifteen initials, forming words of both tones according to the different initials and finals which enter into composition. Allowing seven tones to each of the fifteen initials, and multiplying this sum into the thirty-three finals, we have as the whole number possible of different words in the dialect, three thousand four hundred and sixty-five. But only a few of the sounds here have more than five tones connected with them, while a major part of them have a less number than this in actual use, so that in fact there are not more than seventeen hundred different enunciations in the dialect including the tones which are words in Chinese.

Another difficulty which we meet with in studying this language, next to the tones, and in some respects equal if not superior to them, is the difficulty of distinguishing between aspirated and unaspirated words as spoken by the people. These aspirates affect the meaning of words as much as the tones, so that words having the same tone and the same orthography, excepting the aspirate, may have very different significations. Thus *kang* means to boast, and *k'hang* signifies to see, both words belonging to the third tone. So *chang* denotes a well of water, while *ch'hang* signifies to be grieved, both words belonging to the second tone. So of the other two aspirate initials, p'h, and t'h, when joined with the different finals form words which to an unpractised ear differ little or nothing from the same words unaspirated, but which have a very different signification from them. A single illustration will show the great importance of paying special attention to the *aspirates* as well as to the tones. The word *chew* signifies spirituous liquor of any kind among the Chinese, and for the want of a better term we usually translate it wine. The same word with the same tone aspirated, *ch'hew*, means the hands. The Chinese denote eating and drinking by one and the same word, pronounced *seáh*, in this dialect. Now suppose a missionary without having given much, if any, attention to the aspirates, should attempt to warn the people against drunkenness as well as against other vices so common among the heathen. He would probably be quite as likely to exhort them to beware of drinking *ch'chéw*, their hands, as *chéw*, wine! A mis-

sionary after studying the Chinese language for some three years or more, was once visiting a bereaved family of children who had only a day or two before lost their father. After attempting to console their grief by talking with them in a very friendly manner a short time, he wished to inquire of them if the remains of their father had been interred, but mistaking the *tone*, he asked them if they had killed their father! These instances of course speak for themselves.

From the preceding remarks it is obvious that it is a great desideratum to one studying Chinese to know *what* and *how many* of the 40,000 different characters which it contains, are specially important for him to learn in order to acquire a tolerable knowledge of the language. This is strikingly true in respect to the different dialects. Dr. Morrison's list of characters, which he supposed and which doubtless are, as a whole, the most important and in most common use, contains about twelve thousand principal forms. Should a foreigner attempt to select the same number of words from the 60,000 different words composing the English language, he would probably include some which we should leave out as of but little importance, and leave out others which we should have retained as being more important. Whether this is the fact in regard to the "Paëk Ing" of this dialect or not, or how far it may be true of it, I will not attempt to affirm. This much, however, is true, that this vocabulary does contain a very considerable number of characters which are not found in the above list; while that list contains many others which are not met with in the "Paëk Ing." This vocabulary is arranged according to the initials and finals, with their respective tones quite accurately marked, as explained above. It was by the aid and according to this, that a syllabus of this dialect was formed. I commenced translating this vocabulary the next day after Christmas, and have now translated about one fourth of it, having filled three sides of some twenty-eight sheets of common letter paper. In doing this, I have supposed that I was acquiring a knowledge of the tones, idiom, and other peculiarities of this dialect much faster than I could, for the present, in any other way. I hope to be able before many months, to commence, at least, one day school for Chinese boys, and to engage more directly in publishing the gospel to this people. My views respecting the feasibility of acquiring a knowledge of this dialect compared with the labor of gaining a knowledge of the Cheang Chew, or of the Amoy dialect, are the same that they were when I last wrote you on this subject. When we shall have here the same helps in studying this dialect, and an equal amount of experience which are to be found in studying those dialects, I have no question but that one may learn the language of this people

quite as soon and quite as easily, as he could do that of the people of Amoy or of Cheang Chew. I have now before me the native vocabularies of those two dialects, arranged, like the "Paĕk Ing" of this, according to the initials and finals under their respective tones. According to these vocabularies, the Amoy dialect has twenty-one classes of sounds or words, which have *all of the seven tones*, the Cheang Chew has *eight*, while the dialect of this people has but *four* classes of such enunciations having all of the seven tones under them. If, therefore, the multiplicity of tones in connection with the same enunciations increase the difficulty of learning Chinese, the Amoy dialect is the most difficult of the three, whilst this dialect is the least difficult. The aspirated initials are the same in the three dialects. In respect to the nasals of this dialect, I cannot speak with confidence though I am well aware that they are different, and perhaps more difficult to learn than those of the dialects just named. One reason for thus making the above remarks by way of comparison, is the fact that the dialect of this place has been represented both here in China and in America, as being one *peculiarly difficult to learn*, and which has, I fear, deterred some from coming here who ought to have come, and which will still be an obstacle in the way of others coming, till the true state of the case is more fully known. If, however, any Christian scholar wishes to be extensively useful as a missionary to the Chinese, I know of no field more inviting or promising greater results to his effort than this, whether we regard the acquisition of the dialect, or the immense masses of comparatively intelligent heathen to whom he may make known something of the gospel.

An inquiry is sometimes made respecting the importance of a musical ear in learning Chinese. Judging from the nature of the tones and of the aspirates of this language, it would seem that a *quick and an accurate ear for sounds* in general, with *good vocal organs*, are far better qualifications for this work than a musical ear simply, as that phrase is generally understood. It is not *tune* or *harmony*, or anything of the kind, to which we are here obliged to bend our ears to drink in the sounds of this people; but it is, for the most part, to give them to *short monosyllabic enunciations*, thrown out without rule or system, in respect to time and measure, being but little affected by those which go before or those which follow after, and "always retaining their peculiar place, whether at the beginning or end of a sentence, when interrogating or affirming,—in angry or in soothing words,—when speaking aloud or when whispering;—they remain ever the same." Hence as soon as these different enunciations are clearly apprehended by the ear, it becomes an effort of the memory to retain them, and of the vo-

cal organs to imitate them. But these exercises of the memory and of the vocal organs surely are not necessarily the exclusive property of a musical ear. Let me not be understood as wishing in the least degree to depreciate the value of this most precious gift of God to his fallen creatures. Nothing is more distant from the most ardent desires of my heart. I would that every son and daughter of Adam not only possessed it, but that they were disposed to employ it in one universal song of high praises to their Creator and Redeemer! All I wish is to meet an objection, which I fear is too common with some, and one which may perhaps be now preventing them from doing their duty to the millions of China. It is something like this: "I have not a musical ear, and therefore I ought not to think of becoming a missionary to the Chinese, on account of the *tones* and other difficulties of their language." That there are difficulties to be encountered in studying Chinese is not denied; but the doctrine that none should attempt the study of it with the hope of success, except such as have a musical ear, that is, such persons as have a *fondness for music* and *can sing*, is altogether without foundation and unworthy of belief. It contradicts facts and universal experience. Probably not one in ten thousand of the Chinese knows anything about music or has anything like a musical ear, *as we use these terms*. And yet these tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands learn to speak their own language and speak it well without such aids. This has been the case with millions of this people for centuries, and will doubtless continue to be the case with millions more of them for a long time to come. Children of foreigners born here, at a very early age, learn to speak this language with as much ease and correctness as they do their own mother tongue.

Again, the Chinese not only know nothing or next to nothing about tune or melody, but it is very difficult for them to learn to sing without making the most egregious mistakes and discords, while they are ignorant of such mistakes themselves. A pious and devoted female missionary to the Chinese, now we trust in heaven, on hearing, as she expressed it, "a most unearthly noise in the chapel," ran in with much haste, supposing that several Chinamen must be engaged in a quarrel, when behold, she found them engaged in singing at evening prayers! Such facts show that our *tune* and the Chinese *tone*, necessarily, have very little connection with each other, and that the knowledge and the practice of the latter on the part of Chinamen does not necessarily lead them to an easy apprehension and use of the former. So a musical ear, that is a knowledge and practice of tune, on our part, does not necessarily lead to an easy apprehension and a correct use of the Chinese *tones*. Missionaries to the Chinese have

studied their language for years, who possessed something of a musical ear, but who were not by this means simply, led to appreciate or to understand the *tones*, while others who lay no claim to the possession of a musical ear, have been convinced of the great importance of them in some other way, and have obtained a correct knowledge of them and an ability to express them with ease and accuracy. One of the most strenuous advocates for the importance of the tones, who is now we believe in heaven, after studying Chinese for years, had his attention turned to the subject while attempting to preach to a number of Chinamen in a bazar, by one of them who very pleasantly told him that he understood what the teacher wished to say, though he did not use the right tones to express such ideas.

In the above remarks, I would not be understood to mean that a musical ear is of no importance in studying Chinese ; for, other things being equal, I do believe that it may be useful in studying any language. What I wish to affirm is that a musical ear, *technically so called*, is far from being indispensable to a missionary to the Chinese, and that one possessing a *quick* and *accurate* ear for *sounds in general*, with *good vocal organs*, may hope to be as extensively useful to the Chinese, so far as a knowledge and use of their language simply is concerned, as one who possesses the highest musical powers. To be able to sing the songs of Zion in the language of these idolaters and to teach them to do the same, will of course add much to a missionary's usefulness among them. I hope and pray therefore that the time may come, when every missionary candidate will earnestly seek after and sedulously cultivate this most precious gift, and when no one will think to excuse himself from entering China or any other missionary field simply because he does not possess this additional talent for usefulness.

ARTICLE X.

NOTES ON BIBLICAL GEOGRAPHY.

By E. Robinson, D. D., Professor at New York.

I. Notes on the Route from Beirût to Damascus.

Notwithstanding the multitude of travellers who have passed between these two cities, no one seems as yet to have marked the different points with such accuracy, as to admit of the construction of a good map of the route. Several villages and some streams are not found at all in the maps; and those which are given are not always in the right place. These remarks apply particularly to the Bŭkâ'a and Anti-Lebanon.

A recent letter from the Rev. Wm. M. Thomson of Beirût, dated Aug. 3, 1848, contains an account of a journey made by him to Damascus in April last; and affords new and important information in respect to the features of the country, and the remains of antiquity along the route. I subjoin copious extracts.

The Bŭkâ'a. 'Anjar. Mr. Thomson left Beirût April 12th; and passing over Lebanon, slept at its eastern base on the green margin of the beautiful Bŭkâ'a. The next morning, April 13th, he reached el-Merj in an hour and a half; a miserable Moslem village with a large and filthy khân. Ten minutes beyond el-Merj the Lîtâny is crossed on a low bridge of three arches; the water is deep and of a clayey color. "In forty minutes more," he says, "I crossed the large branch of the Lîtâny that comes from 'Anjar, on the bridge called Dâr Zeinûn. Thus far I had not varied a hair-breadth from the regular road to Damascus; but from this bridge I turned to the left up the stream; and in fifteen minutes reached the fountain called *Birket 'Anjar*, at the foot of the eastern mountain. This is an immense fountain, throwing out the entire river which we had crossed at the bridge Dâr Zeinûn, too deep to be forded. It is also a *remitting* fountain of a very peculiar kind. There is at all times a large stream boiling up from the deep *birkeh;* but at irregular periods there is a sudden and great increase of water; sometimes only once a day; while at other times the increase occurs six, eight, or even ten times a day. Nor does there appear to be any known order in which these irregular flowings occur.

Sometimes they are comparatively small in quantity; at others, the amount of water is prodigious, threatening to sweep away the half-dozen mills that are built around the fountain. There had been a large overflowing just before I got there, abundant evidence of which was everywhere to be seen.

"Perhaps the following may be a probable explanation of these phenomena. All the strata of Anti-Lebanon dip into the Bûkâ'a at an angle varying from 20° to 45°. This fountain boils up in a deep pool, several rods in circumference; and not more than ten feet distant from where the strata dip under the plain. Out of this *birkeh* there flows, at all times, a regular river. Not improbably there must be a number of pools or reservoirs of water in the mountain above, communicating on the syphon principle with this fountain. These fill at different times; and when they discharge their waters separately into the stream, there are many overflowings, and these not large. But it occasionally happens, that a number of these reservoirs discharge at once; and then the quantity is indefinitely increased; and the number of overflowings is for that day proportionally smaller.

"The *birkeh* was anciently surrounded by a double wall of large and smoothly hewn stones; apparently in order to raise the water so as to be carried across the plain to the city of 'Anjar; the walls of which are still standing about ten minutes south-west of the fountain. The wall encloses an oblong square, about one mile in circuit. It had four gates and thirty-two towers; and is about ten feet thick. But the greater part of the city was outside of the walls. This 'Anjar ('Ain el-Jŭrr) is mentioned by Abulfeda (p. 20, ed. Koehler); who also speaks of its "great ruins of stones." Tradition says its very ancient name was 'Ain Kabût; and represents it as once a famous city.[1] I found also, in the quarry on the side of the mountain, large columns which had never been removed; most of them left in an unfinished state,—by whom? I am surprised that so few travellers have visited this singular place; since it lies not more than fifteen minutes to the east of the regular road to Damascus, and is by far the most interesting object on the whole route."

The *'Anjar* here described, is a different place from the modern *Mejdel 'Anjar*, which lies at some distance towards the south-west. That these ruins and quarried columns mark the site of an ancient city, there can be no doubt. But in respect to its ancient name, neither of the appellations, 'Anjar, 'Ain el-Jŭrr, or 'Ain Kabût, affords us any clue. On p. 90, 91, of the present volume of this work, (Feb. 1848,) I have collected the ancient data, which go to show that the

[1] Comp. also Burckhardt's Syria, 4to. p. 8.

city of Chalcis, the seat for a time of Agrippa's dominion, was situated in the Bûkâ'a, probably either at Zahleh or 'Anjar. Later information leads to the belief that no remains of antiquity exist at Zahleh; while at 'Anjar, they are of great extent and importance. We may, therefore, safely regard the ruins at 'Anjar as being in all probability those of ancient Chalcis.

Ridge of Anti-Lebanon. "Following the base of the mountain southward, we came in twenty-five minutes to the mouth of Wady 'Anjar. It is narrow, with high ramparts on each side; the strata all dipping west. In ten minutes the Wady forks; and we took the branch leading up north-east intending to go directly over the mountain to Zebedâny. We wound gradually up this valley for two hours; when we passed over the water-shed into Wady Mâdar, up which we rode for two hours more. The water of this valley flows south into Wady el-Kûrn, and so into the Barada. The rock is everywhere limestone, covered with bushes, but everywhere desert. We passed not a house; met not a man. There is, however, a little cultivation in some parts.

"At the head of Wady Mâdar is the pass called *'Akabet el-Khôkh.* From this lofty point there is perhaps the very finest prospect in Syria. Lebanon, from Jebel 'Akkâr to its southern end beyond Sidon, is beautifully developed. All Jebel esh-Sheikh, south, east, and north, covered with snow, is astonishingly distinct. The whole of northern Syria, too, far beyond Hamah, is spread out like a map,—dim, faded, *worn*, to be sure, but vast, gloomy, mysterious. While directly under our feet, at a vast depth, sleeps the lovely Zebedâny, and its more lovely Bûkâ'a south of it. We were taken wholly by surprise; and rubbed our eyes to be convinced we were not the dupes of enchantment.

"We had been for some time winding up among snowbanks; and the road over the pass was now blocked up by a vast mound of snow, which our horses refused to scale. So sending them round by a different path, we walked down the mountain through wild gorges choked up with snow. It took an hour and a quarter to reach the village; although from the top it appeared as if one might toss a stone into it. I shall not be tempted into a description of the orchards, gardens, fields, and plains of, in, and around Zebedâny. They are the neatest and best kept in Syria; not excepting those of Damascus."

From Zebedâny to Damascus, April 14th. "The beautiful basin of Zebedâny was doubtless once a lake; which in long ages of patient attrition has worn its own deep drain, now called Wady Barada. Nearly in the centre of this basin, about four miles south of Zebedâny,

is an old ruined village called Haush Barada; and *there* rises at once the river Barada. Meandering through the plain in a direction south of east for four or five miles, it slips in among the mountains at et-Tekîyeh; and, a short distance below the bridge, leaps down a bold cataract, and begins a furious struggle with the wild mountain gorges of the Wady. Nor does it rest one moment, until it glides softly into the green suburbs of Damascus. Nobody has done this magnificent gorge justice, either by pen or pencil. The lower bridge, near which are the inscriptions that you have published,[1] is just twenty-five minutes from the head of the gorge.

"The small village es-Sûk is fifteen minutes below the same bridge. To el-Huseinîyeh is twenty minutes further; and at ten minutes more is Deir Kânôn, where are the ruins of a Grecian temple, as I suppose, and a singular mound dividing the bed of the river. Twenty-five minutes from this place is el-Kefr, where are the remains of an ancient town; there are many columns, one of which has on it a Greek inscription much defaced. Here the ordinary road quits the river, and passes across the country direct for Damascus; leaving the stream to break its way through the eastern ridge of mountains.[2] Following the river, which here flows nearly east, I came in ten minutes to Kefr ez-Zeit, where I crossed to the northern side of the stream; and after passing Deir Mukŭrrîn, reached el-Fîjeh in one hour and ten minutes. The precipices rise nearly perpendicularly on each side, six or eight hundred feet; and the scenery is magnificent. The fountain of el-Fîjeh bursts out at a single aperture in the rock with irresistible violence; and at the distance of 120 paces enters, overwhelms, and swallows up the Barada. At this one aperture issues a river several times larger than the Barada,—an unfordable stream, whose entire course is only 120 paces! Over the fountain are heavy buildings of a very antique appearance.[3] They may have been there, for aught I know, when Eliezer of Damascus was Abraham's servant. A stately grove adorns and shelters this noble fountain. There are no inscriptions, nor any other ancient remains in the neighborhood.

"Thirty-five minutes below el-Fîjeh is Bessîma, where the river turns in a southerly direction towards Damascus. Here commences a grand *Tunnel* under the eastern mountain. It is high enough for a man to walk erect. Mr. Wood, the British consul at Damascus, followed it a long way under ground; and subsequently traced it, after

[1] Inscriptions marking the site of ancient *Abila;* see Bibliotheca Sacra, 1848, p. 87 sq.

[2] See a description of the ridges on the eastern slope of Anti-Lebanon, on p. 80 of the present volume.

[3] See Pococke, Vol. II. p. 135, and Pl. 22.

it reaches the eastern plain, for *nine hours* across the desert towards Palmyra; he also informs me that it is again seen not far from that city. He is persuaded, that the water of el-Fîjeh was conveyed by this tunnel and aqueduct to Palmyra; and ascribes this splendid work to Zenobia. He found at el-Fîjeh a tradition, that this was the work of *el-Bint es-Sultân* (the daughter of the Sultân), who reigned at Palmyra.[1]

"As there is no space for a path along the river, the road turns up an opening in the eastern cliffs at Bessîma; and then stretches over a high barren plain for several hours, when you again come to the river at Dummar, near Salahîyeh. From el-Fîjeh to Damascus is 4½ or 5 hours. The immense cliffs above Bessîma are entirely composed of small water-polished pebbles and gravel. When, how, and by what water was this infinite amount of pebbles and gravel worn and polished? How was it piled up into these cliffs of conglomerate, several hundred feet thick? These are questions which require for their solution conditions and data, which confound the science of numbers, and stagger the boldest imagination.

"I reached Damascus just at night-fall; and found a hearty welcome and pleasant home in the family of Dr. Paulding. I may in some future letter mention a few things seen in this great city, which to me at least were new.

"On my return I traced the second river of Damascus [the *A'waj*, probably the ancient Pharpar] to its different sources at Menbej and Beit Jenn, near the southern end of Jebel esh-Sheikh. I afterwards climbed over the mountain, and down by the lake Phiala to Bâniâs; and thence through the Hûleh and Merj 'Ayûn, by Kûl'at esh-Shûkîf, to Sidon and Beirût. All this was a hard ride of four days; which may possibly furnish matter for another letter."

Yours, ever truly,

W. M. Thomson.

II. The Dead Sea Expedition.

In a note introducing an Article in the last number of this work, (p. 397,) I have referred to the expedition to the Dead Sea, proposed and undertaken by Lieut. Lynch with the permission of the Naval Department at Washington. It was the wish of that officer, to carry out his plans in a silent and unobtrusive manner; and up to that period no official information had been given to the public as to the pro-

[1] Compare Pococke, Vol. II. p. 136, 137.

gress of the expedition. Since that time, however, an article has appeared in the Southern Literary Intelligencer for Sept. 1848, from the pen of Lieut. Maury of the National Observatory, communicating some of the main results of the expedition, and giving also extracts from the letters of Lieut. Lynch to the Department. I subjoin here the more important facts, with an occasional remark.

The party set sail from New York about the middle of November, 1847; with the hope and purpose of reaching Beirût early in February. But the necessity of visiting Constantinople, in order to obtain the requisite authority from the Turkish government, and various other hindrances, delayed their arrival on the Syrian coast until late in March. It was unfortunate, that in this way at least one fourth part of the best season of the year was lost.

Two metal boats, one of iron and the other of copper, were transported with great labor from Haifa to the lake of Tiberias. On the 8th of April, the boats, 'each with the American ensign flying, were afloat upon the sea of Galilee.' A wooden boat, the only one on all the lake, and used only for bringing wood from the eastern shore, was purchased for twenty-one dollars, to aid in the transportation down the Jordan. See Bibl. Res. in Pal. III. p. 262.

It was thought, that now the difficulties of the route were at an end. But, contrary to expectation, the Jordan proved more winding than even the Mississippi; and the rapids very frequent and sometimes of irresistible velocity. Boats of no other material of construction could have stood the voyage. The wooden boat, just purchased, sunk and was abandoned on the second day. So great were the difficulties that in two days they accomplished but twelve miles; and not until the 18th of May, did they reach the bathing-place of the pilgrims opposite Jericho. "The Jordan," writes Lieut. L. "although rapid and impetuous, is graceful in its windings, and fringed with luxuriance; while its waters are sweet, clear, cool, and refreshing."

The phenomenon of the supposed unusual fall of the Jordan between the two lakes (16.4 feet in each mile), is accounted for in the opinion of Lieut. Lynch, by the tortuous course of the Jordan. In this distance of about sixty geographical miles, the river winds along through a course of about *two hundred* miles. Within that distance the party plunged down no less than twenty-seven threatening rapids, besides many others of less descent. Taking into view the windings of the Jordan, it is necessary to allow an average fall of only about *six* feet in each mile, instead of 16.4 feet; and for this rate of descent the numerous rapids, now first brought to our knowledge, amply account.

The question may here arise, whether this tortuousness of the Jordan is understood to extend quite to the Dead Sea, or is limited to the more northern portion. The writer of these lines, and also hundreds of other travellers, have scrutinized the valley of the Jordan from the mountains back of Jericho; where the valley and the course of the river lie spread out like a map before the spectator as far as to Kŭrn es-Sŭrtŭbeh, some twenty miles above the Dead Sea; and it probably has never occurred to any one to regard the Jordan in this part of its course as a *winding* stream, but rather the contrary. Those also who have traversed this part of the valley, with the river in sight, have not regarded it as here tortuous. Its windings, if they exist to any great extent in this part, must apparently be confined within, and concealed by, the narrow strip of trees and verdure along its banks.

As the party approached the Dead Sea, they perceived a foetid odor; but this was traced to two streamlets strongly impregnated with sulphur. The Dead Sea, however, soon burst upon their view, into which the little boats bounded with a north-west gale.

The water of the river was sweet to within a few hundred yards of its mouth. The waters of the sea were devoid of smell; but they were bitter, salt, and nauseous.

"As we rounded to the westward," writes Lieut. Lynch, "the agitated sea presented a sheet of foaming brine. The spray, separating as it fell, left incrustations of salt upon our faces and clothes; and while it caused a pricking sensation wherever it touched the skin, was above all exceedingly painful to the eyes.

"The boats, heavily laden, struggled sluggishly at first, but when the wind freshened to a gale, it seemed as if the bows, so dense was the water, were encountering the sledge-hammers of the Titans, instead of the opposing waves of an angry sea.

"At the expiration of an hour and a half, we were driven far to leeward, and I was compelled to bear away for the shore. When we were near to it, and while I was weighing the practicability of landing the boats through the surf, the wind suddenly ceased and with it the sea rapidly fell, the ponderous quality of the water causing it to settle as soon as the agitating power had ceased to act. Within five minutes there was a perfect calm, and the sea was unmoved even by undulation. At 8 P. M., weary and exhausted, we reached a place of rendezvous upon the north-west shore."

The three succeeding days were devoted to sounding. They afterwards proceeded southwards, making topographical sketches as they went, and touching at the copious stream which descends from the hot

springs, as also at the mouth of the Môjib, the ancient Arnon. They approached by degrees the southern extremity of the sea, which at length proved so shallow, that they could proceed no further. Half a mile from the southern shore they found but six inches of water, bordered by an extensive marsh. The present writer also once attempted to bathe in this part of the sea, nearly opposite the middle of the salt mountain Usdum. The bottom was here of sand, and the water so shallow, that after wading out some twenty rods, it reached little more than half way to the knee.

The following extracts from the letters of Lieut. Lynch, in addition to those above given, present the main results of their examination of the Dead Sea.

"We have," says he, "elicited several facts of interest to the man of science and the Christian.

"The bottom of the northern half of this sea is almost *an entire plain.* Its meridional lines at a short distance from the shore scarce vary in depth. The deepest soundings thus far are 188 fathoms, or 1128 feet. Near the shore, the bottom is generally an incrustation of salt; but the intermediate one is soft mud with many rectangular chrystals, mostly cubes, of pure salt. At one time Stellwagen's lead brought up nothing but chrystals.

"The southern half of the sea is as shallow as the northern one is deep, and for about one-fourth of its entire length the depth does not exceed three fathoms, or 18 feet. Its southern bed has presented no chrystals, but the shores are lined with incrustations of salt, and when we landed at Usdum, in the space of an hour, our footprints were coated with chrystallization."

Here then is the singular fact, "that the bottom of the Dead Sea forms two submerged plains, an elevated and a depressed one. The first, its southern part, of slimy mud covered by a shallow bay; the last, its northern and largest portion, of mud and incrustations and rectangular chrystals of salt, at a great depth, with a narrow ravine running through it, corresponding with the bed of the river Jordan at one extremity and the Wady el-Jeib at the other." The greatest depth obtained was 218 fathoms, or 1308 feet; apparently in this deeper ravine.

"The opposite shores of the peninsula and the west coast present evident marks of disruption.

"There are unquestionably birds and insects upon the shores, and ducks are sometimes upon the sea, for we have seen them, but cannot detect any living thing within it; although the salt streams flowing into it, contain small fish. My hopes have been strengthened into

conviction, and I feel sure that the results of this survey will fully sustain the scriptural account of the cities of the plain.

"Even if my letter were less brief, this is not a proper place to dwell upon the wonders of this sea; for wondrous it is, in every sense of the word; so sudden are the changes of the weather and so different the aspects it presents, as at times to seem as if we were in a world of enchantments. We are alternately beside and upon the brink and the surface of a huge and sometimes seething cauldron."

The mode of dealing with the Arabs was judicious and most praiseworthy. Writing from the Dead Sea Lieut. Lynch says: "With the Arabs we are on the most friendly terms. In accordance with the tenor of my orders, I have agreed to pay them fairly for all the services they may render and provisions they may bring—but for nothing more. Thus far, two false alarms excepted, we have been undisturbed in our progress and operations. I scarce know what we should have done without the Arabs. They bring us food, when nearly famished, and water when parched with thirst. They act as guides and messengers, and in our absence faithfully guard our tents, bedding and clothes. A decided course, tempered with courtesy, wins at once their respect and good will. Although they are an impetuous race, not an angry word has thus far passed between us. With the blessing of God, I hope to preserve the existence of harmony to the last.

"With one exception we are all well; save to that one, not a dose of medicine has been administered; and his disease is neither caused nor affected by the climate. Although we are up early and out long, living on two meals a day, save when we are restricted to one, there is no complaining; all seem to be actuated by a high sense of duty."

Having completed the survey of the Dead Sea, the party proceeded to run a level from it to the Mediterranean. After a careful reconnoissance, they selected the pass from 'Ain Terâbeh as the starting point; and Lieut. Dale, to whom the superintendence of the work was assigned, gained the summit of the precipitous ridge or wall on the west, at the close of the second day. This was found to be more than a thousand feet above the surface of the sea. Striking into Wady en-Nâr (the continuation of the Kidron) and up its bed by Mar Sâba and along the foot of Mount Zion up to the pool of Gihon, they proceeded south of Neby Samwîl to Ramleh, and struck the Mediterranean about a mile south of Jafa.

The result of this level as determining the depression of the Dead Sea, has not yet been made public. But as Lieut Maury states that the *depth* of the Dead Sea measures the height of the precipitous western coast, and that *this is very nearly on a level with the Mediterranean*,

we may infer, if the calculations prove correct, that this level will not differ very greatly in its results from the triangulation of Lieut. Symonds.

On the 9th of June, the whole party after an absence of a little over two months, had returned to St. Jean d'Acre on the Mediterranean. They brought back their boats in as complete order as they received them on board at New York. The party were in fine health. Save a flesh wound to one man from the accidental discharge of his piece, not an accident or mishap had occurred to any one. The Arabs would point to them and say, "God is with them."

They were most anxious to have levelled from Acre to the lake of Tiberias; but at this time, after so long exposure, the party was so exhausted from the heat and fatigue, that it was judged necessary to get as soon as possible among the mountains. They traced *en route* the Jordan to its highest source at Hasbeiya; making careful observations as they proceeded. Thence they crossed Anti-Lebanon to Damascus. Although thus prevented from levelling to the lake of Tiberias, they have, nevertheless, full observations of the barometer and the boiling water apparatus from Acre by way of the lake and river Jordan to the Dead Sea.

The party reached Beirût on the 30th of June; having been compelled to forego crossing the highest peaks of Lebanon from increasing exhaustion and illness. On their arrival they mustered but four able-bodied men; and of the rest several (among them Lieuts. Lynch and Dale) required immediate medical attention. On the 12th of July, Lieut. Lynch writes: "The cases have all yielded to vigorous treatment; and I am assured that all danger is past." He adds: "I deem it a duty as imperative as grateful, to express our obligations to the gentlemen of the American Mission,—the Rev. Mr. Smith and Dr. De Forest in particular. By their judicious kindness they have *all* practically evinced a warm interest in our welfare."

"We are awaiting," he says, "the return of our ship,—our eyes ever eagerly scanning the horizon in the hope of once more beholding her. We look to the sea as our best physician; hence our anxiety to be once more embarked upon it."

But their hopes were soon subjected to mournful disappointment. Two days after the date of the preceding letter, Lieut. Dale was taken ill of a nervous fever. He was removed to the summer residence of the Rev. E. Smith at B'hamdûn, a village on the higher parts of Lebanon, just south of the Damascus road. Here he died on the 24th of July. Four days after, Mr. Smith wrote as follows:

"*B'hamdûn, July* 28, 1848.

"I am sorry to inform you, that Lieut. Dale, the second officer of the Dead Sea expedition, is no more. He died at my house in this village on the 24th, after a sickness of eleven days, of a nervous fever. When one thinks of Costigan, and Molyneux, and Dale, he is almost led to imagine there is a fatality attending all attempts to unveil the mysteries of the Dead Sea."

A later letter from the Rev. W. M. Thomson gives the closing scene:

'Abeih, Aug. 3, 1848.

"Mr. Smith will have made you acquainted with the melancholy termination of the Dead Sea expedition. After keeping the body of Mr. Dale for several days in the hopes of taking it to America, they were obliged to bury in Beirût. I performed the religious services last Sabbath at sunset. The poor sailors fired their farewell rounds over the grave; and then we parted immediately, they to sail at once *in their hired ship*, and I to return to my mountain home,—a sad, sad adieu! I have rarely had my sympathies more deeply awakened than in this case of Dale."

Lieut. Dale had hardly reached the age of thirty-five; he was a man of fine appearance and elegant manners, and was selected by Lieut. Lynch to be his companion because of his experience in the exploring expedition under Capt. Wilkes, and as an engineer, first in connection with the Coast Survey, and afterwards in Florida. His loss will doubtless be greatly felt in making up the report of the expedition; the end of which he was permitted to behold, but not to participate in its fruits, nor to enjoy its rewards.

We wait for the official report, before we can have a full view of the scientific results of the expedition. What it has accomplished, has been done well. But it is obvious, that several of the great problems connected with the vallies of the Jordan and of the Bûkâ'a, have not been solved, for want of time. Let us hope that these also will not long remain undetermined.

ARTICLE XI.

NOTICE OF NEW EDITIONS OF CLASSICS.

By an Association of Gentlemen.

The Metamorphoses of Publius Ovidius Naso; elucidated by an analysis and explanation of the fables, together with English notes, historical, mythological, and critical, and illustrated by pictorial embellishments; with a clavis, giving the meaning of all the words with critical exactness. By Nathan Covington Brooks, A. M., Professor of the Greek and Latin languages, and Principal of the Latin High School, Baltimore. Philadelphia: Grigg, Elliot and Co. 1848. 8vo. pp. 388.

This is a formidable title and volume for the first four books of the Metamorphoses, for that is all of the fifteen, and even the four are curtailed somewhat by the judicious omission of objectionable parts. The letter press of the octavo page is also large, and the type small both of the text and notes. The quantity of matter to be read, or which may be read, is therefore considerable. We must, however, think this a fault in a school-book, for students in the early stages of Latin, as unnecessarily increasing the expense. The apology, doubtless, is a desire to make the book attractive; but as the editor informs us in the Preface, the book is designed to follow Caesar's Commentaries, we doubt if the object is attained by the copious extracts from ancient and modern writers, given for illustration—students at that stage will not appreciate them.

We think better of the pictorial embellishments. These are numerous and large, well executed and for the most part chaste. Yet here are some unfortunate exceptions—how can the pursuit of Daphne by Apollo, of Syrinx by Pan, of Coronis by Neptune, represented pictorially, be called chaste? These with several others, remind one of a recent advertisement in Punch—"A new art of printing, by a designing Devil," etc. These faults aside, which however are inexcusable, the embellishments are the greatest merit of the book.

A great fault of the book is the excess of help, which, therefore, becomes no help, given to the student. We refer particularly to the clavis, the superabundance of notes, and translation of words and phrases, and the redundance of the explications. The first two relieve the student from just that labor necessary and beneficial, in

awakening his own powers of research and discrimination. The last, by the uncertainty and contradiction in which the fables are involved, hopelessly, tend only to confuse the juvenile mind. These helps come in the place of specific references to principles, rules, and exceptions in the Grammar which, at this stage, it is the great business of the student to fix in his memory and contemplate in individual application. The editor is not alone in these faults; many editors of classics are now helping students in the same way—by dispensing with dictionaries and grammars—to learn as little as possible of the language they study. Those who adopt this method, of course, will be offended with these criticisms.

But we have graver objections to this work. The Preface states, "Since many of the fables are corrupt traditions of Scriptural truths, I have traced them back to the great fount of purity, the Biblical record, and have given in the notes the parallel passages from the sacred volume." We are sorry that any man should attempt to do this in the rapid process of book making now prevalent, and obviously characteristic of the editor, if we may judge from his Ovid and the advertised works accomplished and in progress. There is great danger in tracing these fables back to the great fount of purity, lest the Bible and Ovid be somehow placed on a level, and the youthful mind be insensibly led to look on the latter with some of the reverence which he owes to the former. If frequent errors, from slight investigation, creep in, and if cautions are scarce where there is evident allusion to Bible history, impressions most injurious may be fixed, which maturer years will not remove. The first note, in our opinion, inadvertently teaches atheism.

> "Ante mare et tellus, et, quod tegit omnia coelum,
> Unus erat toto Naturae vultus in orbe,
> Quem dixere chaos;

Note. "*Ante;* formerly, at the first. The account which Ovid gives, derived from tradition and the writings of the earlier poets, agrees in many respects with the Mosaic account. He begins his narrative with a word similar in meaning to the commencement of Genesis: "*In the beginning* God created the heavens and the earth."

Now with Moses, the word בְּרֵאשִׁית, means a point before all things, when neither sea nor land nor heaven, or even their primordia, existed. But with Ovid *ante* means only the time when the elements were reduced to order;—chaos already—and for aught Ovid knew, having always existed. This is a heaven-wide difference. The ancient heathen never reached the idea of an original *creation*—out of nothing, but only an arrangement of a chaos already existing; in

short, metamorphosis was the extent of their conceptions. The pregnant sense of Moses is: In absolute vacuity, *chaos* as well as all things began to be, and Jehovah created all things, and not Jupiter. It opposes atheism and idolatry. What Ovid says, and the best the poor heathen could say, is: Chaos existing, some god, whoever he might be, cut the formless congeries into parts and made them members of one whole. This is atheism and idolatry, and the editor does not lead the youthful mind to contemplate the difference.

NOTE 2. "*Tellus.* The earth, in all the cosmogonies of the ancients, is produced from chaos: τοῦ χάους δὲ θυγατήρ ἐστι καὶ ἡ γῆ, —PHORNUTIUS."—Of course, the cosmogony of Moses, for he was one of the ancients. Does Moses teach that the earth was produced from chaos?—arranged, it may be, but not *created*, as the youthful mind is left to infer?

NOTE, p. 25, on the line

"Hanc Deus et melior litem Natura diremit."

"*Deus et natura.* This refers to the two principles, mind and matter. We may consider the force of the particle *et* as expositive: God and Nature—even Nature; or, by the figure hendiadys, the God of Nature. The intelligent heathens considered God and Nature synonymous. Thus Strabo:

"Nihil autem aliud est natura quam Deus et divina quaedam ratio toti mundo et partibus ejus inserta."

The power which fashioned the universe Aristotle denominates "Nature;" Anaxagoras calls it "Mind;" so also Plato in his Phaedon. Thales says: "God was that mind which formed all things out of water." Amelius the Platonic, in perfect accordance with what St. John says of the λόγος, remarks: "And this is that reason or word, by which all things that ever were, were made." "Chalcidius declares: "The Reason of God is God himself, "just as St. John says: "The Word was God." "Jupiter is a spirit which pervades all things."

"All Nature is but art unknown to thee."—*Pope.*

The tendency of this note, we think, is dangerous. It places the pantheism and atheism of the heathen philosophers in such juxtaposition and society with the New Testament, as to lead the youthful mind to think the instructions identical, and to look on the heathen as pretty wise and clever reasoners, notwithstanding Paul says, the Gentiles by wisdom knew not God. Nor do we think this fault atoned for by the judicious remark in the preceding note: "How much more

sublime is the idea of God presented in the Bible, who by the word of his power spoke into existence the *material* out of which he formed the universe." We have no reason to suppose the editor other than orthodox ; but it seems to us his abundant citations from the ancient poets and philosophers, and his plan of parallel passages, have all the effect of commending the heathen writings and depreciating the Bible in the eyes of the young, and wholly uncalled for in an elementary book designed for them.

The editor's "explications" are probably as good as any. But what do they all amount to? Take the Fall of Phaethon, p. 136. "Aristotle states that in the days of Phaeton (when?) flames fell from heaven which consumed several countries. Eusebius supposed the event to have happened about the time of Deucalion's flood. St. Chrysostom thinks in the chariot of the sun, guided by Phaethon, he recognizes the fiery chariot of Elias, and is disposed to lay considerable stress on the resemblance of his name to Ἥλιος, *the sun.* If any part of the Biblical history forms the subject of this history, it is more probably the destruction of the cities of the Plain, the stoppage of the sun in the days of Joshua, or the retrogradation of the sun in the days of Hezekiah." This is worse, a great deal, than those inept and barren commentaries on the Bible, which run, 'this passage may mean, so and so ; or it may mean, so and so ; or perhaps the meaning is, so and so ;' leaving the reader to the sage conclusion, the passage may mean something if one only knew what it *did* mean. The truth is, the explanation of the fables, for the most part, is irretrievably lost, in the distance and darkness of a world that by its wisdom knew not God. The fables, woven and tinted by the master's hand, are beautiful, exquisitely beautiful ; but they are like the dissolving views of the magic lantern, form without substance ; if, rustic-like, we attempt to touch them, there is nothing there.

The editor has admitted several fables of bad moral tendency. We instance the story of Callisto. It is altogether too gross in its dress and too horrible in its principles, to find a place in a book designed for ingenuous youth. The story, stripped of its gaudy dress, is just this. Jupiter finds Callisto alone, represented as innocent and pure, deceives her by assuming the form of Diana her patron, forcibly abuses her.—Diana cruelly banishes her from her chorus without judge or jury ; and Juno, with studied malignity, changes her into a bear, while pleading for mercy. And yet the editor says, in his explication, "the fable abounds with good moral lessons, as it tends to display the effects of crime upon the person who indulges it. The grove, once so pleasant to her, and the conscious woods, are her aversion ; so occu-

pied is she with thoughts of her guilt, that she almost forgets her bow and quiver; the silent lip, the abstracted manner, the downcast eye, the fallen countenance, the timid look, the sudden flush, and the slow step, indicate the degradation that have come upon her spirit."

What a misrepresentation! She was conscious of no guilt—she could not be, for the fable represents her as a feeble but resisting sufferer, in the grasp of the artful and powerful deity. She was conscious of degradation but not of guilt. She was simply the victim of the malignant cruelty of two deities, and the blind cruelty of a third. The explication compared with the fable of Ovid, is a painful confusion of moral distinctions, and with both editor and author it is a violation of poetical justice which makes the blood curdle. Whatever explanation may be given as the ground of the fable, that which will arrest the attention of the student is the poetry of Ovid, and it seems to us, the chief moral to be drawn, is the abominable nature of heathen idolatry. If such were the gods, what must have been the people? Answer, Romans, chap. ii. It is true the mythology may be studied to advantage here and the Latin is simpler than Virgil's. But these advantages are dearly purchased, at the hazard of exposure to such flagrant elements. Ovid is beautiful, often exceedingly tender and moving. What can be more tender than Io writing her name in the sand, and the misery of the father at the disclosure? What more moving than the story of Procne and Philomela? What more moving, tender and graphic, than Ceyx and Alcyone? But how he prostituted his graphic pen and inflammatory pencil—dangerous to the sternest virtue—is notorious. No excellences atone for this. What better is Satan for putting on an angel's shining robe? The best way to guard dangerous paths is to block them up. Expurgated editions of lascivious authors are slight defences to the fascinating fields. We would therefore forego the alleged advantages and adhere to the no less tender and moving and graphic Virgil—incomparably more chaste—as the initiatory of classic poetry. Let Ovid be reserved for a maturer age and for other purposes; but when it is too late, the man deplores the curiosity of the youth, and is compelled, from stage to stage of his inestimable probation, to adopt the confession, "I see the better and approve, but pursue the worse."

History of the Greek Alphabet, with Remarks on Greek Orthography and Pronunciation. By E. A. Sophocles, A. M. Cambridge: Geo. Nichols. 1848. 12mo. pp. 136.

In the first part of this treatise, Mr. Sophocles has given the substance of the "Traditions and Fictions concerning the Alphabet;" subjoining the passages, in which they are found, from the Greek and Roman writers. These accounts will be interesting to the curious student, and though often as absurd as they are contradictory, they are important as showing all that the ancients pretended to know of the origin of the alphabet. The theories of the Alexandrine grammarians on this subject are ingeniously explained. The "History of the Alphabet," and "Remarks on Orthography," form the second part. The facts on which this portion of the work is based, are drawn chiefly from the Greek Inscriptions, collected and edited by Boeckh. For the *fac simile* of the characters, which the reader will wish to see, he is referred to the work of Gesenius on the Remains of the Phenicians, and to Franz's *Elementa Epigraphices Graecae*. Liberties taken with orthography and etymology by the ancient grammarians, and innovations they made for the sake of fancied or real analogies, are discovered by this examination of inscriptions. Many false views which have been propagated quite to our own times are thus corrected, and the true forms restored.

The *Digamma*, about the existence and use of which there has been so much speculation and debate, is admirably treated here, and a list of *digammated* words added with their forms as appearing in Latin and the Teutonic tongues, which well deserves the attention of the student. The select inscriptions and portions of inscription introduced to illustrate the progress of Greek orthography are rendered easily intelligible by the versions into the common dialect and the observations by Mr. Sophocles.

The "Remarks on Orthography," and the facts presented in this connection are also of great importance as incidentally furnishing unimpeachable testimony on the subject of "Pronunciation," with the discussion of which the volume closes.

The interchange of the vowels and diphthongs, and the mutations of the consonants show, at least, what was their *relative* sound. The "Roman mode of writing Greek Words," and the "Greek mode of writing Latin Words," are fully and accurately given with illustrations. "Romaic or Modern Greek Pronunciation,"—which is *vernacular* to Mr. Sophocles, and on which, therefore, as here represented,

scholars may confidently rely even in the minutest points,—next follows, with the "Probable Ancient Pronunciation." In treating of the latter, he has been guided by ancient authorities, where they existed, and in cases wherein he has been obliged to offer his own conjectures, he has followed the dictates of a sound judgment, and we are the more inclined to receive his hypotheses as he seems neither to make them unnecessarily nor to substitute them for facts.

This work, though unpretending in its form, is very valuable and trustworthy,—valuable as ably discussing questions, which meet the student at the very beginning of his studies and constantly recur as he proceeds,—trustworthy as coming from one of the most accomplished and judicious Greek scholars now living.

We have here given a mere syllabus of its contents, but propose in some future number to examine the work in detail, and to consider the questions of which it treats.

ARTICLE XII.

REVIEW OF OWEN'S THUCYDIDES.

By James Hadley, Assistant Professor of Greek in Yale College.

The History of the Peloponnesian War by Thucydides; according to the text of L. Dindorf; with Notes, for the use of Colleges, by John J. Owen, Principal of the Cornelius Institute. New York: Leavitt, Trow & Co. 1848. 12mo. pp. 683.

Thucydides is not the earliest Grecian writer to whom we give the name *historian;* yet the earliest of historians could not have been more thoroughly original. Alike in the conception and the execution of his work he shows himself independent of his predecessors. He has his own notions as to the scope and aim of history. Others had been mythographers, annalists, story-tellers; it was his purpose to be something widely different. He could not content himself with reproducing the mere form and surface of the past, in a bare chronicle of outward actions and appearances; he sought to account for the past, to show how that which had been came to be. Nor in this attempt was he satisfied with attributing everything singular or mysterious to

an ever ready supernatural machinery. In the public life of States he saw the product of natural causes, the work of human agency, in which the common character of man is seen under the modifying influences of diverse political conditions. Man acting through the social and civil forms which man has organized to shape his action—this is the great idea of Thucydides. Hence his continual eagerness to get behind the outward act, to bring out the circumstances and the motives in which it had its origin, and thus to show that it was nothing capricious, arbitrary, unaccountable, but the very thing which was to be expected from such a character in such a situation. Hence too his confident belief that what has been will be; history, having its foundation in the nature of man, which is always essentially the same, must present essentially the same phenomena from age to age. With this view he does not hesitate about applying to the past the maxims of the present, as in his exhibition of heroic times; nor does he doubt that the present will reappear in the future, and so writes his book as a κτῆμα ἐς ἀεί, that men may derive instruction from its precedents in every similar concurrence of events. Thus history—historic writing—is in his view the past giving lessons to the future; and its proper effect, to make that future not essentially different from the past, but only wiser and better.

Original in his conception of history, Thucydides is no less original in historical criticism. Unlike his predecessors, he does not receive with simple faith everything which he has heard. He balances evidence; he weighs authorities; he discusses probabilities; he is ever on his guard against deception. Everything claiming to be fact is subjected to a strict examination; and rigorously set aside unless it can make good its claim. In Thucydides, cautious, penetrating and exact, the modern historiographer finds his best authority, his main reliance for the earlier times of Greece. Other writers of antiquity may be fuller in their statements; in many instances they do no more than make the darkness visible; but when Thucydides, though with but half a sentence, touches on any subject, a ray of light has darted into the gloom. The historian, plodding wearily along, as through a quagmire, unable to discover solid footing—if he chance to find a passage of Thucydides lying in his course—feels that he has at length secured one firm spot, on which he can abide with confidence, and from which he can form some judgment as to what is safest in his future progress.

In the Peloponnesian war Thucydides found a subject every way worthy of his powers. It was a crisis in his country's history. The annals of the preceding half century are chiefly occupied with the

causes that led to it and the preparations that were made for it; those of the century following are little more than a development of its results. We see here Athens and Sparta, the leading States of Greece, well matched though most dissimilar, alike only in ambition, contending for the Hegemony; grouped around them are the minor States, bound to their principals by the most various ties of love, fear, hope, gratitude, necessity, and sustaining almost every relation of alliance or dependence. The contest is long continued; disputed on both sides with desperate valor and unfaltering determination. All the resources of all the belligerents are exhausted in the struggle. The war is full of enterprise, intrigue, vicissitudes of fortune, unexpected success, unexpected failure. Never, perhaps, has so much of political experience, been crowded within such narrow limits both of space and time. An action so various and complex, so critical, far reaching in its antecedents and its consequences, was fitted to give full employment for the highest order of historical abilities.

Thucydides lived, mature in years and judgment, through the whole period of the war; an actor in some of its scenes, an attentive observer of all. It has generally been assumed, that he waited for its termination, before commencing the composition of his work. On this point, however, Ullrichs, in his *Beiträge zur Erklärung des Thukydides*, has recently put forward a new theory. The Peloponnesian war consists of two parts, separated by the peace of Nicias, an armistice rather than a peace, which was concluded in the year 421, and subsisted, in name if not in fact, till the Sicilian expedition in 415. Observing now, that in the first books of his history, Thucydides makes no allusion to the Sicilian expedition or any of the events which followed it, while he repeatedly speaks of the war as continuous from first to last—Ullrichs supposes that he began to write after the peace of Nicias, regarding this as the conclusion of the contest, and not anticipating the speedy renewal of hostilities—that under this impression he wrote some three books and a half, when the war broke out afresh; that then recognizing in these two struggles only different acts of the same great drama, he waited for the catastrophe, after which he resumed the work and brought it to the point at which it now breaks off.

Dr. Owen's present volume includes nearly all that portion of the history, which is set off as of earlier composition, in the theory of Ullrichs. We have here the first three books with an extended commentary; the text occupies 178 pages, the notes, about 500 more.

Some may perhaps object to this amount of annotation as excessive. Yet all will probably admit that, if a copious commentary is allowable

in any school book, it is proper in a school edition of Thucydides. From earliest times he has been regarded as a difficult author. His weight of meaning, his sudden transitions, his extraordinary freedom of construction, his frequent anacolutha, his affectation of antiquity, must have made his books anything but light reading to the Athenians of his own day. And Cicero declares that he found the speeches of Thucydides almost unintelligible. A Greek writer, whom Cicero could hardly understand, will not be very easy to the American schoolboy. He will be continually stumbling upon difficulties, which he cannot overcome, and therefore should not be required to overcome by his own unaided efforts. If he is not to grope blindly and wearily from page to page, lost in a labyrinth of uncertainties, disgusted with himself and his author, it is a point of indispensable necessity that he should be supplied with constant illustration both of words and things.

We would not indeed be understood as denying, that the work before us might have been compressed to some extent without lessening its value. There is a good deal of annotating in it, which we cannot but regard as otiose, though fully sensible how difficult it is to draw the line between things that may be of use to somebody and things that cannot be of use to anybody. Even where the matter is of unquestionable importance, the style of the editor often seems to lack condensation. Rigorous retrenchment would have made it more distinct, pointed and effective. The writer who is sparing of his words will be careful in selection; and a loss in quantity may be more than compensated by increased intensity. In this particular there are few commentators, who might not learn from Krüger, the latest editor of Thucydides, whose learned notes present rare models of perspicuous brevity.

Much has been accomplished within the last thirty years for the study of Thucydides. The labors of Bekker and Poppo have made the text one of the best which we possess among the remains of classical antiquity; so that, as Dr. Arnold thought, no great improvement is to be looked for from future criticism. At the same time a crowd of annotators, chief of whom are Poppo, Göller, Arnold, Krüger, have furnished satisfactory solutions for almost all the difficulties which beset the interpretation. A large mass of valuable materials was thus placed at the disposal of the American editor; and Dr. Owen has shown that he is acquainted with these materials and understands their value. He has used them abundantly, but not indiscriminately, exercising an independent judgment, and keeping constantly in view the circumstances and wants of the class for whom his work is intended.

Fronting the title-page is a very neat map of Greece, reduced from Kiepert's, representing the state of the country at the opening of the Peloponnesian war. In the notes, too, Dr. Owen has not overlooked the geography of his author. On this head he acknowledges his obligations to Col. Leake, whose merits in relation to the togography of Greece no one will deny; though when Dr. Owen following Bloomfield, calls him "the first geographer of our age," he makes an assertion, which, to say the least, is somewhat hazardous.

One of the most striking features of the present work is the attention everywhere paid to the train of thought, narrative and argument in the original. Each chapter is introduced in the commentary by a full analysis of its contents; and in many cases, a series of chapters, forming a separate whole, has a special introduction, defining its subject, and presenting a general conspectus of its structure. The style and mode of treatment of the editor in this department of his labors, are fairly enough represented, in faults as well as merits, by the following remarks, which usher in the Funeral Oration of Pericles.

"Chapters xxxv—xlvi. These chapters contain the celebrated funeral oration of Pericles, which has ever been considered a masterpiece of eloquence, whether regard be had to the grandeur of the theme, the patriotic and liberal sentiments advanced, or the simplicity and dignity of its style. The exordium is contained in chap. 35; then having briefly announced the subject-matter of his discourse (chap. 36), he passes to a consideration of the internal policy, habits, customs, refinement, learning, liberality of the Athenians, for the existence and perpetuity of which the departed worthies had fought and died (chaps. 37—41). He then eulogizes more directly the persons whose funeral rites they are celebrating, and exhorts the Athenians to imitate their virtues, bravery and patriotism (chaps 42, 43); the parents and relatives of the deceased are then addressed in words of sympathy and encouragement, after which the orator closes with a brief peroration (chaps. 44—46).

"No adequate justice can be done in a brief abstract to this noble effort of one of the greatest minds which Greece or any other country ever produced, and it is commended, therefore, without further remark to the student as well worthy of his careful and frequent perusal. The more it is read and studied, the more prominent will be its grand and towering dimensions, the more impressive the noble sentiments with which it abounds. Let no one who would put himself under its full influence, cease his efforts to master it until he can read it fluently at a sitting, without the aid of grammars, lexicons or annotations. Then as he reads, he will find his sympathies with the theme and the

occasion awakened, his emotions enkindled, his soul inspired with high and generous sentiments, and he will rise from its perusal with a more ardent love of country, more liberal, enlightened and exalted views of what constitutes the true glory of a State, and better qualified to act the part of a good citizen in whatever sphere of action he may be called to move."

We have read over with much satisfaction the notes by which the editor has sought to make this speech of Pericles—a speech scarcely less celebrated for its difficulty than its excellence—intelligible to the student. We beg leave to introduce here a few remarks, which have occurred to us in the course of this examination; omitting the many points in which we should agree perfectly with Dr. Owen, and noticing for the most part those alone, on which we could wish for more or less of change.

L. II. c. 35. § 1. *καὶ μὴ ἐν ἑνὶ ἀνδρὶ πολλῶν ἀρετὰς κινδυνεύεσθαι εὖ τε καὶ χεῖρον εἰπόντι πιστευθῆναι, and not that the virtues of many should be perilled upon one man, intrusted to him alike, whether he may speak well or ill* (literally, *to have been intrusted to him both if having spoken well and if worse*). . . . *πιστευθῆναι* is epexegetical of *κινδυνεύεσθαι.*" On this passage we should prefer to follow the scholiast, and take *πιστευθῆναι* in the sense not of *entrusting*, but of *believing;* we would also treat it as the *object* of *κινδυνεύεσθαι*, which, meaning as it does *to be endangered = made to incur danger*, may be followed by the danger as its object. See Matthiae Gr. § 534. b. The risk to which the virtues of many men are here supposed to be subjected, is that of being understood and hence believed according to the representation of the funeral orator, whether he has spoken well or ill; i. e. whether he has set them forth as they deserved, or (*χεῖρον*) done them less than justice. This interpretation seems to account more perfectly than any other for the *aorist* participle *εἰπόντι.*

C. 36. § 2. Pericles, speaking of the generation just departed, says, *κτησάμενοι γὰρ πρὸς οἷς ἐδέξαντο ὅσην ἔχομεν ἀρχὴν οὐκ ἀπόνως ἡμῖν τοῖς νῦν προσκατέλιπον;* but immediately adds, *τὰ δὲ πλείω αὐτῆς αὐτοὶ ἡμεῖς οἵδε—ἐπηυξήσαμεν.* How reconcile these two statements, of which the first appears to say, that the Athenian empire had attained its present greatness in a former generation; and the second, that it had been rendered greater by the contemporaries of the speaker? Dr. Owen remarks: "There is no real contradiction . . . as the empire had not been essentially enlarged, but rather strengthened and reduced to a settled policy of government by Pericles and those of his own age." This is Poppo's view: *ὅσην ἀρχὴν* considered as referring to *extent of territory*, which excludes of course from the fol-

lowing *τὰ πλείω αὐτῆς* any material enlargment of domain. Krüger, on the other hand, has given a different explanation, which appears to harmonize better with historic facts. He understands *ὅσην ἀρχὴν* of the *Hegemony*, regarded simply as supremacy among the Grecian States, without exact limitation either as to the authority conferred by that position, or as to the territorial limits within which it was acknowledged; so that in the ensuing sentence we are at liberty to understand extension in either one or both of these respects, in territory as well as in prerogative.

C. 36. § 4. *ἀπὸ δὲ οἵας τε ἐπιτηδεύσεως ἤλθομεν ἐπ' αὐτὰ καὶ μεθ' οἵας πολιτείας καὶ τρόπων ἐξ οἵων μεγάλα ἐγένετο.* For the construction of *οἵας—οἵων* reference is made to Crosby Gr. § 539. 2. b., which is inapplicable here, as it relates to constructions like *λεύσσετε —οἷα πρὸς οἵων ἀνδρῶν πάσχω*, where two interrogative words are combined in a single interrogative clause. We may notice also another instance of irrelevant reference, III. 22. 7. *καὶ οἱ τριακόσιοι αὐτῶν οἷς ἐτέτακτο, κ. τ. λ*, "the article has reference to the relative *οἷς* which follows, and therefore retains its demonstrative force (S. § 166. 2. b.) *those three hundred who had been appointed.*" If the article be taken as a demonstrative in this place, we may with equal propriety consider it as such in a great majority of the cases where it stands; the use, which Mr. Sophocles calls demonstrative and describes in the remark referred to, is widely different, as appears from the phrases *τὸν ὃς ἔφη*, etc. cited as examples.

C. 36. § 4. *νομίζων ἐπί τε τῷ παρόντι οὐκ ἂν ἀπρεπῆ λεχθῆναι αὐτά. λεχθῆναι* has *αὐτὰ* for its subject, and is itself the subject of *εἶναι* understood, to which *ἂν* may be referred." This would require *ἀπρεπὲς* instead of *ἀπρεπῆ;* if *εἶναι* is supplied, *αὐτὰ* must be made its subject, and *λεχθῆναι* taken as a limiting infinitive, *that they would be not inappropriate to be spoken.* But it is not necessary to supply *εἶναι;* the construction may be represented tolerably well by rendering, *thinking that on the present occasion they would be spoken without inappropriateness.* We should likewise differ from Dr. Owen as to the construction in c. 38 § 2. *καὶ ξυμβαίνει ἡμῖν μηδὲν οἰκειστέρᾳ τῇ ἀπολαύσει τὰ αὐτοῦ ἀγαθὰ γιγνόμενα καρποῦσθαι ἢ καὶ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων*, where he makes *τὰ ἀγαθὰ* the subject of *ξυμβαίνει;* better connect *ξυμβαίνει ἡμῖν καρποῦσθαι, κ. τ. λ. it is our fortune to enjoy*, etc.

C. 37. § 1. *καὶ ὄνομα μὲν διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐς ὀλίγους ἀλλ' ἐς πλείονας οἰκεῖν δημοκρατία κέκληται.* For *διὰ . . . οἰκεῖν* the editor gives two interpretations. 1. *Because the government is not administered for the benefit of the few, but of the many.* (Arnold after Steph. and

Gail). 2. *Because the administration of government is not in the hands of the few, but of the many.* (Poppo and Goeller, 2nd ed.). Dr. Owen though he says the passage "does not seem admissible (susceptible?) of any interpretation wholly free from objections," yet pronounces at last in favor of the latter rendering; nor are we disposed to find fault with his decision. The context calls for such an explanation, and the construction, though certainly unusual, is after all less harsh and violent than Dr. Owen seems to think it. We may translate almost literally, *because the carrying on of government extends not to few but to many*, which naturally enough suggests the sense required.

C. 38. § 1. *ὧν καθ' ἡμέραν ἡ τέρψις τὸ λυπηρὸν ἐκπλήσσει.* "*καθ' ἡμέραν ἡ τέρψις* for *ἡ καθ' ἡμέραν τέρψις.*" So also Krüger; but the difference of collocation appears to be more than a mere accident, and requires to be accounted for. We may say, perhaps, that *καθ' ἡμέραν*, standing as it does in the text, is not a mere adjunct of the noun, but qualifies the sentence, *whereof day by day the enjoyment drives away vexation.*

C. 39. § 2. *οὔτε γὰρ Λακεδαιμόνιοι καθ' ἑκάστους . . . στρατεύουσι.* This reading, which is the common one, makes it necessary to take *Λακεδαιμόνιοι* as a generic designation for the Lacedaemonians and their allies—*for neither do the Peloponnesian confederacy wage war by single States*—a rather harsh expedient. It would have been well, perhaps, to notice the easier reading *καθ' ἑαυτούς* which, though resting on little manuscript authority, is preferred by Poppo and Krüger.

C. 40. § 2. *οὐ τοὺς λόγους τοῖς ἔργοις βλάβην ἡγούμενοι, ἀλλὰ μὴ προδιδαχθῆναι μᾶλλον λόγῳ πρότερον ἢ ἐπὶ ἃ δεῖ ἔργῳ ἐλθεῖν.* "This use of *ἔργῳ* in the sense of *in truth, in good deed*, is very common." *Ἔργῳ* here stands opposed to *λόγῳ* and signifies not *in truth*, but *in action.* Translate, "regarding not speech as any detriment to action, but rather not to be instructed by speech, before proceeding in action to those things which are necessary." In the next section Pericles continues: "For in this also we (Athenians) are peculiar, that we show the greatest courage, though at the same time we consider fully what we are to undertake: *ὃ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀμαθία μὲν θράσος, λογισμὸς δὲ ὄκνον φέρει.*" Dr. Owen adopts the best account of this rather difficult clause, but has fallen, apparently through inadvertence, into some inconsistency of statement. He begins by saying, "the only difficulty in this passage results from the grammatical use of *ὅ*, which refers to *τολμᾶν* and *ἐκλογίζεσθαι*, i. e. the quality of daring combined with reflection." But further on he remarks: "Matthiae and Poppo consider the relative as repeated and explained in *λογισμός* . . . the

sense being as though it had been written *ὃ τοῖς ἄλλοις, ἀμαθίας θράσος φερούσης, ὄκνον φέρει.* This appears to me the best explanation." Obviously, however, it would be absurd to say, *the quality of daring combined with reflection, brings cowardice*, etc.; and *ὅ*, if it is repeated and explained in *λογισμός*, can refer only to *ἐκλογίζεσθαι.*

C. 42. § 3. *καὶ γὰρ τοῖς τἆλλα χείροσι δίκαιον τὴν ἐς τοὺς πολέμους ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος ἀνδραγαθίαν προτίθεσθαι.* "*τοῖς—χείροσι* has the force of the adnominal genitive after *ἀνδραγαθίαν.* Krüger remarks (Gr. § 48. 12. R. 2) that the adnominal dative of possession for the genitive is a form of speech which does not frequently occur in Attic prose; and that where neither the position nor the sense requires us to connect the dative with the substantive, we should take it rather with the verb. In the present case, certainly, the latter is the superior construction. Translate, "Since indeed for those who in other points were worse, it is just that the manly courage, which led them to the wars in support of their country, should be put forward (as a shield or screen, to cover their failings)."

C. 44. § 1. "*ὅσοι πάρεστε—ἐπίστανται.* On the sudden transition from the *oratio recta* to the *oratio obliqua*, cf. Kühner, § 345. R. 6." There is a change here from the second person to the third; the orator goes on to speak *about* those whom he had just before been speaking *to;* but there is no quotation in the passage, and of course no passing from direct to indirect quotation—from the *oratio recta* to the *oratio obliqua.*

It will be seen, that of the points which we have noticed, some are the results of inadvertence,—slips, such as will now and then elude the keenest vigilance, and creep into the most elaborate productions. Others again are more or less matters of question; points on which different minds, with the same evidence before them, may come to different conclusions. They are very far from proving, as we are very far from believing, that the commentary has been hastily or carelessly prepared. On the contrary, our examination, limited and imperfect as it has necessarily been, has satisfied us that we have in this work the fruits of labor at once diligent and successful. So obvious, indeed, are the traces of industrious study, as to render quite unnecessary, expressions such as the following: "but I am disposed *after much reflection* to adopt as the sense of the passage" (note on II. 42. 4.); "*after much examination* I have adopted this as the best interpretation, though others may prefer to translate differently" (note on II. 40. 4.); which a pardonable self-distrust has led the editor to insert. Dr. Owen has shown in this book, that he is not one of those, who can rest content with past attainments, careless of further progress. No one

who compares his Thucydides with the highly popular and useful school books which he had previously edited, can fail to recognize its superiority. Its style is more correct, clear and business-like; it is nearly free from the faults of awkwardness and inaccuracy, by which those earlier works were occasionally disfigured. It shows much less of a certain disposition to *improve* upon the author, to dilate upon his beauties and endorse his moral teachings, to supply emotions that the student ought to feel, which in its predecessors bordered now and then upon the ludicrous. It exhibits a more mature scholarship, more thorough and exact research, and more of that practical skill in dealing with one's materials which practice only can bestow.

Scholars will await with interest the publication of the second volume, destined to contain, according to the announcement of the preface, "the remaining text of Thucydides, brief annotations, and copious verbal, historical and grammatical indices of the whole work."

ARTICLE XIII.

LITERARY AND THEOLOGICAL MISCELLANIES.

Age of Literary Men.

In a late Number of a German periodical, a list is given of the names and ages of some of the more prominent scholars and distinguished individuals in the various walks of life in Germany, together with some explanatory remarks. We subjoin the list as a matter of interesting record and of comparison, on a number of important points, with the theologians and literary characters of England and the United States. The first list includes those who lived to the age of 80—92 years.

Terstegen,	92 yrs.	Goethe,	83 yrs.
Spalding,	90	Planck (the elder),	82
Knebel,	90	Hans Sachs,	82
Tiedge,	88	Pestalozzi,	81
Gerstenberg,	86	Kästner,	81
Bodmer,	85	Duke Ulrich of Brunswick,	81
J. G. Müller,	84	Göckingk,	80
Gleim,	84	Kant,	80
Frederic Jacobs,	83	Jerusalem,	80
Hermes,	83	Wieland,	80

In this list are men who struggled with depressing poverty; others who could gratify every want; some who lived in quiet; others who performed the most active duties; some who were endowed with the highest poetic gifts; others who had no imaginative faculty. Creative

power and activity as authors continued in some to extreme old age; some lived in the extreme South; others in the cold North.

The next list enumerates some distinguished men who lived to the age of 70—79.

Thümmel,	79 yrs.	Minutoli,	77 yrs.
Klopstock,	79	J. G. Jacobi,	45
A. W. Schlegel,	78	Schlözer,	74
Klinger,	78	Justus Möser,	74
Nicolai,	78	Agricola,	74
C. F. Weisse,	78	Christian Stolberg,	73
Stägemann,	77	Pfeffel,	73
Jung-Stilling,	77	Ramler,	73
F. H. Jacobi,	76	Thomasius,	73
J. P. Uz,	76	Salis,	72
Veit Weber,	75	J. Adolf Schlegel,	72
Chr. Wolf,	75	Olearius,	71
A. Lafontaine,	75	Matthisson,	70
J. H. Voss,	75	Eberhard,	70
Müller (painter),	75	Spener,	70
Claudius,	75	Ph. Vonzesen,	70
Schroeckh,	75	Paul Gerhard,	70
Breitinger,	75		

In the above list of names, there was a great variety and contrast in pursuits, outward circumstances, education, etc., but not so great as in the individuals first named. Most of them, as students and authors, were confined to one or two departments. A. W. Schlegel and Minutoli were exceptions. Most of them were also intellectually vigorous till the close of life.

The next enumeration embraces:

Leopold Count Stolberg,	69 yrs.	Gottsched,	66 yrs.
Anna Luise Karsch,	69	Weckherlin,	66
Alb. v. Haller,	69	F. A. Wolf,	65
Moscherosch,	68	Brentano,	65
Hebel,	68	J. A. Cramer,	65
Hang,	68	C. A. Vulpius,	64
J. V. Andreä,	68	J. M. Miller,	64
Von Lilienstern,	67	Lichtwer,	64
Von Houwald,	67	Francke,	64
W. Von Humboldt,	67	Luther,	63
De la Motte Fouqué,	67	Jean Paul,	62
Abr. a Sancta Clara,	67	Hofmanns Waldau,	61
Tchudi,	67	Hegel,	61
Rollenhagen,	67	Engel,	61
Manso,	67	Zinzendorf,	60
Arehenholz,	67	Lavater,	60
Theremin,	66	Kosegarten,	60
Schleiermacher,	66	Gotz,	60

Eleven of the above were clergymen. Most in the list led a quiet life; others, e. g. Luther, Humboldt, were men of the greatest activity. In literary character there is almost every variety. The literary power in most continued till the last. "In general, old age is not be marked off

before the sixtieth year. What lies this side of that limit belongs to the youthful and fresh, or to the ripe and vigorous, or to the gradually fading powers. In the last stages of middle life, death is wont to gather his richest harvests, not only among the thinkers and poets, but in all departments of action."

The following is the list which is given of those who died between the age of 36 and 22. No instances are furnished of the men who deceased between the age of 36 and 59.

Schenkendorf, . .	36 yrs.	Novalis, ...	29 yrs.
Phil. Moritz, . . .	36	Günther, ...	28
Hutten, ...	35	E. Schultze, . . .	28
H. Von Keist, . .	35	Hölty, ...	28
Grabbe, ...	34	Cronegk, ...	27
William Müller, . .	32	W. Hauff, ...	25
J. E. Schlegel, . .	31	Wackenroder, . . .	25
Paul Flemming, . .	31	Körner, ...	22

Excitability was the characteristic of nearly all the individuals in this list. Six were soldiers. Four of the others were travellers; one of them traversed Russia and Persia. Three only led a quiet life. The early death of nearly all is to be ascribed directly or indirectly to their nervous activity. In the constitution of a very few only, lay the germ of disease. Most of these young men belonged to the north of Germany.

German Conversations-Lexicon.

The ninth edition of this widely circulated Lexicon has recently been completed. It is published in 120 parts or fasciculi, which form fifteen volumes. The last two numbers contain a very valuable General Index, in 112 pages, small type. The full title of the work is the following: "Allgemeine Deutsche Real-Encyclopädie für die gebildeten Stände Conversations-Lexicon." The price of the set in Germany, printed on very good paper, is about 20 Thaler = $15. In the last No. a list of the contributors to the various editions is given. The whole number is 368. They are found in all departments of literature and science. Some of them were or are very eminent in their respective departments, and are known throughout the world. The responsible editor of the ninth edition was Dr. Karl August Epse. The work has been owned by the firm of Brockhaus & Co. since 1808, having been purchased in that year by F. A. Brockhaus, father of the present publisher. The eighth edition was completed in 1837, and up to 1842, 31,000 copies had been sold. The seventh edition of the Supplement, in four volumes, was published in 1838—41. The Encyclopaedia Americana was based on the seventh German edition. The first idea of the Lexicon was suggested by Dr. Löbel. The first volume was published in 1796. Löbel died on the ap-

pearance of the third volume in 1798. The sixth and last volume was published in 1808. Of the fifth edition, 32,000 copies were printed. The ninth edition has the text of the eighth as its basis, but every article, without exception, was carefully revised, and where necessary, amended and enlarged. All the Articles that were in the Supplement, and not in the eighth edition, are incorporated into the ninth. An important number of new Articles in all branches of knowledge, especially in Ancient History, Geography and Special History, have been added. The original design of this work was to furnish facilities for self-education, to supply persons engaged in manual labor, or who were but partially educated, with the information necessary for common reading, for intelligent conversation and for the general business of life. "It is at the present time," in the language of the editor, "rather a thesaurus of all valuable knowledge, and embraces the entire circle of the sciences in all their particulars, as far as the same are important for an educated public; it forms a progressive chronicle of all remarkable events down to the present time, a mirror of all the outward and inward phenomena in society, the State, the church, science, art and literature. It is not merely a work for reference; but it is a manual for daily use, a reading-book, attractive by its judicious selection and agreeable form of exhibition." In many respects, we may add, it is very valuable for the scholar. Among its contributors in the various editions were such orientalists and classical scholars as Rosenmüller, Gesenius, Rödiger, Kosegarten, Brandis, Becker, H. Brockhaus, Palmblad, etc.

The principal deficiency in this great work is owing to the want of an evangelical spirit in some of its conductors and principal contributors. It cannot, indeed, be called a neological production. It does not openly attack or secretly undermine the Christian faith. It seeks to be, at least in many of the Articles, fair and impartial. It would not offend any prevailing taste in Germany. Its object is to bring out a work which shall be universally acceptable. But it ought to exhibit the truth fully, fearlessly and heartily. For such subjects as Luther, Calvin, Reformation, Pietism, Christian Missions, and many others, writers should be selected whose feelings fully accord with the theme. A neologist would necessarily give an unfair and imperfect representation of many topics. The Lexicon, in accordance with its objects, should not be indeed religious. It is scientific, historical and literary. Yet it is a work for Christendom; a vast number of its readers are Christians; many of its writers are professed ministers of Christ, or teachers of theology.

Many of the above remarks apply to the American translation of the seventh edition. The great men of the church are thrust into a corner. Brief and imperfect notices are given of theologians of commanding in-

tellect, while some insignificant military general, who was in a successful skirmish or two, is conspicuously delineated and lauded. The writer, we have understood, of many of the biographical articles, relating to New England puritans and Presbyterian worthies, is a Roman Catholic.

New Latin Lexicon.

A new Lexicon of the Latin Language is in the process of publication, by Reinhold Klotz, Professor in the University at Leipsic, and, for many years, one of the editors of the "Jahrbücher für Philologie," a distinguished classical journal. Prof. K. is also well known as one of the ablest editors of Cicero's Orations. The Lexicon, which he has now undertaken, must be regarded, therefore, as the fruit of many years' study, under the most favorable circumstances, by an accurate and accomplished scholar. The work will appear in fifteen fasciculi, making two large octavo volumes, price in Germany about $6. When the work will be completed, we are not informed. It is published in a very superior style, by George Westermann of Brunswick. It is printed in double columns, on fair and strong paper, with a clear and new type. Indeed we have rarely seen a large Latin book printed so well. The author's aim is thus stated in his prospectus: "First, to exhibit the treasures of the Latin language itself, i. e. the roots of the Latin tongue and the single derivative words, as fully as the narrow limits of a lexicon will permit; to ascertain their derivation or relationship as far as possible; to fix their fundamental meaning, and to define them more exactly in their actual use, so as to develop the particular significations of a word from its fundamental sense, and to exhibit these significations in their natural order, and to devote a careful attention to the technical expressions of statesmen, diplomatists, jurists, rhetoricians, naturalists, husbandmen, architects, etc., which have not always been handled with equal felicity."

"Secondly, to bring before the reader the connections in which single words appear, though not with the fulness of a thesaurus, yet with greater completeness than has been common and in a form better than has been attained in the larger lexicons, so as to point out more exactly the grammatical constructions in which the words are found, whereby, e. g. the prepositions, which sustain the relations of the Cases, and the other particles which make up the grammatical joints, shall be placed before the eye in the most careful manner."

In order to accomplish these two great objects, the author says he has paid special attention to etymology, synonyms and antiquities. In respect to the synonymous forms of words, he has pointed out the differences, e. g. between abitio and abitus, abortio and abortus, actio, actus, actum and agmen, discessio and discessus, scriptio, scriptura, scriptus and

scriptum, etc. Not seldom has he gone into the synonymous syntactical forms, e. g. he has indicated the difference between manere aliquem and alicui, subire aliquem rem and alicui rei, etc.

What are the merits of this Lexicon, compared with that of Freund, we are not able to decide. A classical friend, who has made some use of Klotz in his daily studies, expresses high satisfaction with the sound judgment, discrimination and accurate knowledge of the language everywhere exhibited. In two respects, at least, Freund appears to us to have the advantage. One is, that he gives the history of the language, the biography, so to speak, of the words. The other advantage is in the arrangement. Freund makes separate paragraphs of the subdivisions of an article. Klotz presents all which he has to say in an unbroken mass, so that it is difficult for the eye instantly to catch what is needed. How Klotz will include his materials in two volumes, we do not perceive. Down to the word *animus*, there are 416 pages, while Freund closes that word on the 286th page, yet the latter fills four octavo volumes, making in all 4596 pages.

Literary Institutions in Switzerland.

We are pained to observe in the public journals that the literary institution or college at Lausanne, and also the one at Neufchatel have been discontinued, or suppressed by the radical governments of the two cantons. The college at Lausanne was founded in 1587; in this the late Dr. Vinet was professor. The college at Neufchatel was made illustrious for some years by the palaeontological discoveries of Professor Agassiz, now connected with Harvard University. He is a native of Neufchatel. His discoveries in the history of fossil fishes, it is said, have thrown more light on that branch of the study than those of any one since Cuvier. The college, standing near the lake, contains a valuable Museum of natural history, and the rocks and fossils illustrating very satisfactorily the structure of the Jura mountains.

In 1834, a university or high school was established at Berne. The Museum contains a noble collection of the natural curiosities of Switzerland. The departments of mineralogy and geology are particularly instructive. A complete series of fossils, collected by M. Studer, are deposited here. The town-library contains 40,000 volumes and many valuable Mss.; among the latter are more than 1000 Helvetic Mss. The distinguished Haller, a native of Berne, was once librarian. The management of the university is in the hands of the city government. Attempts have been made, within a few years, as also in Zurich, to introduce teachers holding neological sentiments, contrary to the wishes of a large portion of the people.

The University of Zurich was opened on the 29th of April, 1833. It has about 200 students. The building of the suppressed Augustinian convent has been appropriated to its use. Professors, expelled from other countries for liberal opinions, have found refuge here. Among the most eminent professors are Oken, Schönlein, J. E. Orelli and J. G. Baiter, the last two joint editors of the edition of Cicero, in eight volumes, Hitzig, the well known biblical commentator, Hirzel, the commentator on Job, etc. Among the individuals who have in successive periods rendered this city illustrious were Conrad Gesner, Zuingli, Bullinger, Hottinger, Heidegger, Bodmer, Breitinger, Lavater, Solomon Gessner, Hess, and many others. It was the native place of Pestalozzi. Here the first entire English version of the Bible by Miles Coverdale was printed in 1535. The city is now distinguished for its large printing establishments and its trade in books. The library of the university contains many original Mss. of the early reformers. The town library has 45,000 printed volumes and Mss., Zuingli's Greek Bible, with marginal notes, chiefly Hebrew, by himself, a portrait of that reformer and his daughter, three autograph letters in Latin of Lady Jane Grey, and other inestimable treasures.

The University of Basil was founded in 1460, the first important seminary for the advancement of learning established in Switzerland. It numbered among its professors, Erasmus, Euler and the Bernouillis. Several of the present professors have an European reputation. Dr. de Wette, now sixty-eight years old, is professor of theology, and stands at the head of living commentators on the Scriptures. He is the son of a preacher at Ulla, near Weimar, and was a professor in the University of Berlin from 1810 to 1818. He was removed from his office in the last named year, in consequence of writing a letter of condolence to the mother of George Sand. He came to Basil in 1822. He lectures on dogmatics, morals and exegesis. K. R. Hagenbach is well known as an orthodox theologian and able church historian. He is a native of Basil and was born in 1801. His father was professor of medicine. He was a pupil of Lücke, Neander and Schleiermacher. He has published two collections of sermons, History of Christian Doctrines, Lectures on the Nature and History of the Reformation, etc. The other professors of theology are J. J. Stähelin, who has written on the Messianic Prophecies, J. G. Müller, and William Hoffmann, the excellent successor of Dr. Blumhardt in the Mission Institute. In the philosophical faculty is C. F. Schönbein, everywhere known for his discoveries in chemistry, etc. William Wackernagel, born in Berlin in 1806, was made professor of the German language and literature in Basil in 1832. His publications are numerous and popular. The whole number of professors, ordinary and extraordinary, is thirty-one. The funds of this university are small. The public or city library, contains 50,000 volumes, among them the Acts of the

Council of Basil, with chains attached to the binding, many inestimable Mss., some of the works of Erasmus, etc.

Public instruction at Geneva is under the general direction of the Council of Public Instruction. This council has the control, 1. of the Academy, which is composed of four faculties, Theology, Law, Sciences and Letters, and which counts twenty-six professors, and about 150 regular students; 2. the colleges of Geneva and Carouge; 3. the secondary school for girls; 4. fifty primary schools, numbering 4000 scholars; 5. auxiliary establishments, viz. the public library, the botanic garden, the academical museum and the observatory. The College of Geneva was founded by Calvin in 1538. The pupils are divided into eleven classes, four of which are called French classes, in which students are fitted for industrial or commercial pursuits. The number of scholars is between 400 and 500. At the end of each academical year, about the middle of August, there is a public celebration, at which there is a distribution of prizes, etc. The successful pupils receive their medals at the hands of the chief syndic in St. Peter's Church. The venerable company of pastors has had in charge religious and theological instruction. The public library, in the basement of the college, was founded in 1551 by Bonivard, "the prisoner of Chillon." It contains about 40,000 volumes and 500 Mss. It is rich in works of ancient theology. It has a collection of the autograph letters of Calvin, of Beza, Farel, Viret, and other reformers, the homilies of Augustine, written on papyrus of the sixth century, a translation of Quintus Curtius, found in the luggage of Charles the Bold, after the battle of Grandson, a beautiful Ms. of the four Gospels, etc. The Museum, commenced in 1818, has been augmented by the geological collections of Saussure, Brongniart, Jurine and Necker, and is very rich in ornithology. There is a complete series of the minerals of the country, and of the fishes of the lakes. The botanic garden was formed in 1818 by the celebrated botanist Decandolle. Among the distinguished individuals who have adorned this small city, were the Turretines, Calvin, Beza, Le Clerc, Cellérier, Casaubon, Scaliger, Godefroy, Burlemaqui, De Lolme, Dumont, Necker, Sismondi, Mallet, Bonnet, Saussure, who first ascended Mont Blanc, Prevost, Decandolle, Huber, Dacier, De la Rive, Madame de Stael, A. Decandolle, Maunoir, etc. For an account of the New Theological School, see Bib. Sacra, III. p. 786.

The publications in all departments of literature have greatly fallen off since February last, except political books and pamphlets which everywhere spring up. Among the few in classical and theological literature we notice the following:

Principia Grammatices Neo-Persicae cum Metrorum doctrina et dialo-

gis Persicis, pp. 352. This grammar, by Gabriel Geitlin, professor of oriental languages in the university of Helsingfors, is commended in the Halle Allg. Litt. Zeitung, "as a book in the highest degree useful to the teachers and learners of the Persian language."—Caspari C. P. Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Buch Jesaia u. zur Geschichte der Jesaianischen Zeit. 1 Thlr. 24 Sgr. This is a part of the "Biblico-Theological and apologetico-critical Studies," by Prof. Delitzsch and Caspari.—Reinhard F. W., Versuch über den Plan, etc. 24 Sgr. This is a new edition of Reinhard's celebrated book on the Plan of the Founder of the Christian Church, with an appendix and additions by the excellent Dr. Heubner of Wittenberg.—Die Grundlehre d. Religion Jesu, nach dem Principe des Evangelischen Protestantismus ermittelt u. systematisch entfaltet von Dr. August Francke, 1 Thlr. 1848.—Schneidewin F. W. Die Homerischen Hymnen auf Apollon 12½ Ngr.—Parallelgrammatik d. Griechischen u. Lateinischen Sprache von Dr. V. C. F. Rost, F. Kritz u. F. Berger, 2ter Theil. Schulgrammatik d. Lat. Sprache. von Dr. Kritz u. Dr. Berger. Rost is the well known Greek grammarian, Kritz is the editor of Sallust and belongs to Erfurt.—Euripides' Werke. Griechisch mit metrischer Uebersetzung u. prüfenden u. erklärenden Anmerkungen von J. A. Hartung. "The literary activity of Hartung has in various ways and in a very productive manner, been employed on Euripides. By his fundamental learning and extensive reading, by accurate observation of the characteristic peculiarities of the poet, by acute groupings, original judgments, and a fine artistic feeling, he has aided in various ways to the understanding of the poet." *Jena Allg. Litt.* 28.—Dr. Karl Ullmann of Heidelberg has published a pamphlet in which he advocates the equality of all the Confessions and unlimited civil freedom.—The Christian Symbolic of the late Dr. Marheinecke, exhibiting the creeds of the Catholics, Lutherans, Reformed, Socinians, Greek Church, is about to be published under the charge of Mathies and Vatke.—Ulfilas, Urschrift, Wörterbuch, Sprachlehre, von Ign. Gaugengigt, Bevorwortet von Dr. M. Fertig.—An important work has just been published by Dr. Karl Wieseler, professor of theology in Göttingen, entitled: "Ein Versuch über die Chronologie und Abfassungszeit der Apostelgeschichte und der Paulinischen Briefe." The first book treats of the chronology of the Acts of the Apostles, the second, the time of the writing of the Pauline epistles, with an Appendix on the time of the writing of the epistle to the Hebrews. Two *excursus* treat of the residence at Rome, partly of Paul, partly of Peter.

Dr. J. F. Röhr, the great rationalist leader, died at Weimar, June 15, 1848. He was born near Naumburgh, July 30, 1777.—Died at Berne, July 12, 1848, Dr. Matthias Schneckenburger, professor of theology in the university there. He was born in 1804. He published a Commentary on the Epistle of James, Contributions to New Testament Introduc-

tion, on the origin of the first canonical Gospel, the orthodox doctrine on the two Natures of Christ.—Dr. F. A. Bornemann, professor in the gymnasium at Meissen in Saxony, died at Kirchberg, June 27, 1848. He edited an edition of Xenophon's Cyropaedia, 1828, 1838, 1840, of the Memorabilia, 1829, Scholia in Lucam, 1830, Acta Apostolorum, 1848, etc. He was born April 9, 1786.—The Swiss historian, Henry Zschokke, born at Magdeburg, March 22, 1770, died June 27, 1848, at Aarau, Switzerland. His writings are very voluminous. Selections from his historical writings have appeared in 16 vols. 12mo. His last publication was "Hours of Devotion to promote true Christianity."—The celebrated Chateaubriand died in Paris, July 4, 1848. He was born at St. Malo, Sept. 4, 1769.—Berzelius, the distinguished chemist, died at Stockholm, Aug. 7, 1848.—A bust of Martin Luther has been at last placed in the celebrated Valhalla. It stands between those of Holbein and Copernicus.—Prof. Ewald has accepted an invitation to return to Göttingen, the scene of his former labors.—Dr. Stickel has become ordinary professor of Oriental literature in Jena.—April, 1848, completed 500 years since the founding of the university of Prague.

The English Language by R. G. Latham, M. D., fellow of King's College, Cambridge, late professor of the English language in University College, London. Second edition, revised and greatly enlarged. London: Taylor and Walton, 1848, 8vo. pp. 581.

This elaborate grammar—to be regarded in the second edition as almost a new work—is divided into seven parts. Part I. takes up the general ethnological relations of the English language; Part II. the history and analysis; Part III. the sounds, letters, pronunciation and spelling; Part IV. the etymology; Part V. the syntax; and Part VI. the prosody. The ethnological division discusses the Germanic affinities of the English language and the languages of the Gothic stock, the Celtic stock of languages and their relations to the English, the Anglo-Norman and the languages of the classical stock, and the position of the English language as Indo-European. We quote the following from the preface: "In 1840, so little had been done by Englishmen for the English language, that in acknowledging my great obligations to foreign scholars, I was only able to speak of what *might be done* by my own countrymen. Since then, however, there has been a good beginning of what is likely to be done well. My references to the works of Kemble, Garnet and Guest show that my authorities *now* are as much English as German. And this is likely to be the case. The details of the Syntax, the illustrations drawn from our provincial dialects, the minute history of individual words, and the whole system of articulate sounds can, for the English, only be done safely by an Englishman; or to speak more generally, can, for any lan-

guage, only be dealt with properly by the grammarian whose mother tongue is that language. The *Deutsche Grammatik* of Grimm is the work not of an age nor of a century, but, like the great history of the Athenian, a κτῆμα εἰς ἀεί. It is the magazine from whom all draw their facts and illustrations. Yet it is only the proper German portion that pretends to be exhaustive. The Dutch and Scandinavians have each improved the exhibition of their own respective languages." "Accurate and systematic scholars of other countries prepared the way for the Deutsche Grammatik—Ten Kate in Holland, Dowbrowsky a Slavonian and Rask a Dane."

Infant Baptism a Scriptural service, containing a critical survey and digest of the leading evidence, classical, biblical and patristic, by Rev. Robert Wilson, professor of Sacred Literature for the General Assembly, Royal College, Belfast. London: Longman and Co. 8vo. pp. 534.

Among the recent American publications or works now in press are the following:

Manual of Ancient Geography, by Dr. S. C. Shirlite, of the Royal Gymnasium at Wetzlar. Translated by Profs. Beck and Felton of Cambridge.

The third American edition, from the fifth English, of Prof. William Smyth's Lectures on Modern History, edited by Jared Sparks.

Moritz Meurer's Life of Martin Luther, from the original authorities, translated by a Lutheran clergyman of New York city, pp. 692.

The unaltered Augsburgh Confession, with a Preface and an Historical Introduction, and the three chief Symbols of the Christian church, etc. by C. H. Schott, translated from the German, 18mo.

The Doctrine of the Person of Christ, by Dr. Sartorius. Translated from the fifth German edition, by Rev. O. S. Stearns. Boston: Gould, Kendall and Lincoln, 18mo. pp. 161.

Recent Discourses delivered in the chapel of Brown University, on many of the leading moral and religious topics of the day, by Francis Wayland, D. D.

Sketch of the History of Harvard College, by Samuel A. Eliot. Boston: Little and Brown, 1848, 18mo. pp. 190.

Modern French Literature by L. Raymond de Vericour, revised with notes and additions by Wm. S. Chase. Boston: Gould, Kendall and Lincoln, 1848, 12mo. pp. 444. [A valuable and seasonable work.]

The Pulpit Orators of France and Switzerland, sketches of their Character and specimens of their Eloquence, by Rev. Robert Turnbull. New-York: Robert Carter, 1848, 18mo. pp. 341. [This book contains sermons from Bossuet, Flechier, Bourdaloue, Fenelon, Massillon, Saurin, Vinet, Monod A., Grandpierre, Lacordaire, Merle D'Aubigné and Gaussen.]

Baptism with reference to its Import and Modes, by Edward Beecher, D. D. New-York: John Wiley, 12mo. pp. 342.

INDEX.

A.

Abila, or Lysanias, 79.
Adam, his relation to his posterity, 268.
Advancement of Society in knowledge and virtue, 358. Value of a hopeful frame of mind, 358. Trust in the Spirit, in biblical predictions, in the fitness of the Gospel, in the success of the Gospel, 359; in the general state of the world, 360; proved from facts, 361; some prominent events in the church, 362; from events in civil society, 363. Great influence of Grecian culture and civilization, 364. Predominance of Goths in Europe, 367. First French Revolution, 369. Encouraging inferences, 373.
Agency Divine in production of matter, 342.
Akkár in Northern Syria, 20.
Aleppo, Tour to, 1, 243.
Aleppo in Syria, history, 467. Salt plain, 471. Castle of Sphery, 472. Tribes of Arabs, 473. Castle, mound, churches, 475. Taxes in the 18th century, 477. Progress, ruins, 479, 663.
Alphabetical Psalms, age of, 58.
American Oriental Society, 201.
Apamea, Greek inscription at, 91; ruins of, 685.
Apostolical Constitutions, new edition of, 296.
Anachronism in Acts 5: 36; in relation to Theudas, 409. [457.
Antioch in Syria, history, 455; ruins,
Arabic Society at Beirût, 203.
Arca in Northern Syria, 15.
Arvad or Ruad, 251.
Asiatic Society at Paris, 199; London, 200.
Austrian Universities, 203.

B.

Barîn in Syria, 689.
Batrone, account of, 8.
Beirût, tour from to Aleppo, 1, 247.
Beings spiritual, constitution of, 633.
Bernstein, Prof. at Breslau, employed on a new Syriac Lexicon, 390.
Biblical Geography, notes on, 79.
Bibliothèque Royale at Paris, 383.
Botta M., excavations by near Nineveh, 148, 200.
British Museum, origin of, 388; history, 389; amount of books, etc. 389.
Brooks's edition of Ovid's Metamorphoses, 771.

C.

Cambridge University, England, statements respecting, 192.
Catholicism in Italy, 597. Subject of interest, 598. Causes of the growth of the religion, 598. Physical features of the country and historical associations, 599. Antiquity, 600. Permanent funds, 601. St. Peter's church, 602. Value of permanent funds, 603. Value of the Fine Arts, 604; as connected with the Catholic religion, 605. Position of the Fine Arts hereafter, 606. Truth in creeds, 608. Weakness of the system, 609. Not favorable to physical prosperity, 110. A materializing system, 611; a bap-

tized paganism, 614. Childish and unreasonable, 616. A religion of symbols, sensible signs, 619; based on a few picked passages from Bible, 621. Character and history of present pope, 623.

Chace, Prof. George I., On the agency of God in the production of material phenomena, 342. On the spirit and constitution of Spiritual Beings, 633.

Chalcis, Notes on by Dr. Robinson, 90.

Chase Irah, D. D., edition of the Apostolical Constitutions, 296.

Chinese language, remarks on by a missionary in China, 751. Number of characters, 731; 12,000 in common use, according to Dr. Morrison, 752.

Classical authors, review of new editions of, 171, 771.

Colleges at Cambridge, Eng., 192; at Paris, 194.

Constitution of spiritual beings, by Prof. Chace, 633.

Constitutions Apostolical, new edition of, 296. Contents, 297. Specimens, 297. A pious fraud, but good derived from them, 298. Authors well meaning men, 300. Prevalence of frauds, 303. A true picture of existing realities, 304. Translation faithful, 305. Introduction of infant baptism, 307. Passage of Tertullian considered, 309; his real views, 311.

Conversations-Lexicon, completion of the 9th edition, 788.

D.

Dale, Lieut., Death of, 770.

Damascus, Tour to from Beirût, 760.

Daphne in Syria, 454.

Davidson, Dr. Samuel, Church polity of the New Testament, 394. Reviewed, 513. Introduction to the New Testament, 596.

Dead Sea, Depression of, 397. Exploring expedition to, 764.

De Wette, Commentary on Romans 5: 12–19, 263. Character of as a commentator, 264. His exegetical Manual, 266.

Dictionary of Philosophical Sciences noticed, 114.

Divine Agency in the production of material phenomena, 342. Opinions of Hindoos and Egyptians on the question, What is matter? 342. Views of the transcendentalists of Germany and France, 343. The view which allows to matter no real existence incorrect, 344. Source of evidence is our senses, 345. Matter is more than a manifestation of Divine power, 347. Animal endowments fitted to their ends, 349. Harmful qualities counteracted, 351. Disarrangement of an organ no part of its design, 353. Simplicity of God's works, 355. Matter not eternal, 357.

Druses, destruction of by the Moslems, 665.

E.

Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament by Davidson, 513. Three questions, What is the meaning of church, in whom is its government vested, what relation do its officers sustain to each other? 513. Dr. D. agrees substantially with Cambridge platform, 514. Each church complete in itself, 515. Ordination by the church, 517.

Edinburgh city and University, Description of, 385.

Edwards, Prof. B. B., Articles by, 58, 192, 358, 375, 378, 551, 597.

El-Medineh, Ruins of, 19.

Emmons, Dr., Remarks on a sermon of his by Mr. Withington, 625. Reputation of Dr. E., 625. Opinion of Dr. Chalmers, 626. The Bible and systems of divinity, 626. We study nature by the influence of systems, 627. The general mind coöperates with the individual, 629. A man cannot go to the

Bible with his mind as a *tabula rasa*, 631. The Bible is perfect, yet how slowly has it been interpreted, 632.
Erfurt, Luther's religious experience in the cloister at, 519.
Ezekiel, the prophet, circumstances of his life, 435. Character of his times, 437. Personal character, 438. Intellectual and practical views, 441. Style and manner, 442. Composition of the book, 444. Arrangement of his prophecies, 445. Time of his consecration, 701. Mode of representation rests on the Pentateuch, 703. Kindred to Isaiah's vision, 704. Design of theophany, 705. People to whom he spoke, 706. Symbols allied to Babylonian, 707. Notes on the verses, 709.
Excavations at Khorsabad, 148, 200.
Experience, Luther's at Erfurt, 519.

F.

Frederic William, of Prussia, his coronation oath, 593.

G.

Galatians, Epistle to, analysis of the argument, 97.
Gebilee in North Syria, 258.
Geography, biblical, Notes on, 79.
Gorgias, Remarks on a passage in, 431. [of, 776.
Greek Alphabet, Sophocles's history
Greek Literature, Study of, by Dr. Siedhof, 23.
Greek translation of Ps. 137, 276.

H.

Hackett, Prof., on the argument in the epistle to the Galatians, 97. On the anachronism in relation to the sedition of Theudas, 409.
Hadley, Prof. J. H., Review of Owen's Thucydides, 777.
Hävernick, Professor, notice of, 434. His Introductory Remarks to Ezekiel, 434. Commentary on the first two chapters and part of the third, translated, 700.
Hamilton, Sir William, Edition of Reid's works and character as a philosopher, 109.
Hebrew Studies, 59.
Hengstenberg's Commentary on the Psalms, 392.
Hermann, Godfrey, 31.
Hermel, remarkable monument, 695.
Heyne of Göttingen, 31.
High School, Edinburgh, 387.
Hitzig's Commentaries, 391. On the symbols in Ezekiel, chap. i., 724.
Homes, Rev. Henry, On vineyards in the East, 283.
Hûms in Syria, history of, 683.

I.

Inscriptions, Greek in Syria, copied by Rev. W. M. Thomson, Remarks on by Pres. Woolsey, 586.

J.

Jebeil, the ancient Byblos, 6.
Jeble el-Aala, Ruins of, 667. [461.
Jebel St. Simon in Syria, Ruins at,
Jebilee in Syria, described, 258.
Jerome, St., His Life and Times, 117. Editions of his works by Erasmus and Martianay, 120. Birth at Stridon in Illyria, 121. At Rome in A. D. 363, 122. Baptism, 124. Travels in Gaul, 124. Studied Hebrew and Chaldee, 126. Various disputes, 128. Became a monk at Bethlehem, 131. Translation of the Bible into Latin, 132. As a man of letters, 136. Commentator, 138. Last days, 135.
Jerusalem, topography of, 93.
Jesuits in France, 576. First attempts, 577. Serious difficulties, 579. Queen's efforts in their behalf, 579. Opposition of the Sorbonne, 580. Henry IV., 582. Arnauld's opposition, 583. Expulsion, 584. Restoration by Henry, 585.
Jordan valley, Depression of, 397.

Jordan appears to fall more than 16 feet between Tiberias and the Dead Sea, 400. Notices indicate a swift current, but not a rapid, 401. Comparison of the Orontes, Elbe and Danube, 402; Rhine and Mohawk, 403; Missouri, 404. Notice of Lieut. Symonds's survey, 405. The problem not solved, 407.

K.

Kedes, Lake of, 690.
Khorsabad, Excavations at, 148.
King's College Chapel, Cambridge, Eng., 193.

L.

Ladakia in North Syria, described, 260.
Language, its relation to Thought, 650. Language a spontaneous origin, 651; is expressed thought, 653. Thought immutable, language variable, 655. Proofs of the vital relation of language to thought, 657. Need of speech is constitutional, 659. Greek and English languages, 661.
Latin Lexicon, new by Klotz, 790.
Latin, Siedhof on the study of, 23. Latin verse, 34.
Latham's New English Grammar, 795.
Lebanon, Tour from, 243, 447, 363.
Lebny in Syria, 699.
Library, National at Paris, 383. Other libraries, 385.
Lincoln, Prof. J. L., his edition of Livy reviewed, 176.
Livy, New edition of a part of, by Prof. Lincoln, 176.
Literary Men, Age of, 786.
Luther, Martin, at Erfurt. The origin of the Reformation to be traced to Luther's experience there, 519. Ignorance of the Bible, 520. Becomes a monk, 521. Opposition of his father, 523. Enters the Augustinian convent, 524. Novitiate in 1505, 525. Augustinians, 526. Luxurious life of the monks, 527. Effect of the cloister life on Luther, 529. Violence of his feelings, 530. Familiarity with the Bible, 531. Taking the vow, 533. Studies the scholastic theology, 535, 540. Personal appearance, 536. Influence of Staupitz, 537. False ideas of Christ's character, 539. Preparation for the priesthood, 541. Consecration as priest, 543. Feelings in respect to the mass, 545. Change in his religious views and feelings, 549. Justification by faith, 550.

M.

Mager, Professor, Remarks on language as showing the genius of a people, 45. [254.
Markûb, population of the district,
Mar-Marone, Convent of, 697.
Martyn, Henry, 192.
Maurer, Continuation of his Commentary, 391.
Mears, John W., translates Roscher on Thucydides, 481.
Metaphysics, Works in reviewed, 102.
Morell's History of Philosophy reviewed, 103.
Müller, Prof. J., of Halle, Work on the Christian Doctrine of Sin, 499. Nature of sin, 500. Is God's will the primary ground of right? 501. Unity of the Divine commands, 503. Essential principle of moral law is love to God, 504. Essence of sin is selfishness, 505. Guilt of sin, 507. Man responsible for it, and falls under condemnation, 507. Human will originates sin, 508. Guilt proved by the judgment, 509; also by the atonement, 511.
Munich, city and university, 378. Architectural taste, 379. Galleries of arts, 380. Public Library, 381. Telescopes and lithography, 381.

N.

Nahum, Prophecy of, 551. Fresh interest given to this prophecy by the excavations at Nineveh, 551. Labors of Botta and Layard, 552. Sculptures, 553. Nineveh and the Assyrian empire, 554. Time in which the prophecy was delivered latter part of Hezekiah's reign, 557. Native place of Nahum probably at El-Rosh in Galilee, 557. Style and manner, 558. General outline of the argument, 560. Particular outline, 561. Translation, 562. Notes, 566. Method of attacking a city, 570. Gates of the rivers, 571. Comparison with the Egyptian Thebes, 573. Barbarities of war, 575. [771.

New Editions of Classics, Notice of,

Notes on Biblical Geography, 79.

O.

Orations of Thucydides, 481.

Oriental Society, American, 201.

Oriental Studies at Paris, 198.

Orontes, Source of, 697.

Osgood, Rev. Samuel, Article on Jerome and his Times, 117.

Ovid, Brooks's edition of his Metamorphoses, 771.

Owen's Thucydides, Review of, 777.

P.

Paris, colleges at, 194. Library national, 381.

Park, Prof. E. A., Translation of Schott's remarks on the structure of a sermon, 731.

Pelagian Controversy, Essay on, 205. Pelagianism starts from man, Augustinism from God, 206. Life and character of of Pelagius, 207. Augustine's life, 208; baptized by Ambrose, 210; death in A. D. 430, 211. Outward history of the controversy, 211. Views of Celestius, 212. Jerome and Orosius, 213. Two synods condemn Pelagianism, 214. Externally crushed in 420, inward history, 216. Pelagius's views of freedom and primitive state, 217. Augustine's views of the same, 218. He distinguishes between posse non peccare and non posse peccare, 219. Fall and its consequences in Pelagius's view, 221; Augustine's, 223; who held that original sin is propagated in natural generation, 227; his arguments, 228. Objections by Pelagius, 230. The doctrine of grace and redemption, 233. Grace, according to Augustine, the power of a divine creation, 237; irresistible, 239. A Catholic and Protestant tendency in Augustine, 241. Defects of Augustine's system, 242.

Porter, Prof. Noah, Review of works in metaphysical Science, 102.

Phenomena, Material, Divine agency in the production of, 342.

Plato, Remarks on a passage in his Gorgias, 431.

Plutarch's Lives, New edition of, 726.

Polity, Ecclesiastical, of New Testament, 513.

Prussia, Speech of Frederic William IV. king of, 593.

Psalm sixty-eighth, Interpretation of, 312. Three rules of interpretation, 313. Psalm imitated from Song of Deborah, 314. Occasion of writing it when the ark was brought to Jerusalem, 315. Course of argument, 315. New translations, 316. Commentary, 318. Time of writing it in the reign of Pharaoh Necho, close of the 7th century B. C. 341.

Psalm 137, Greek translation of, with notes, 375.

Psalms, Alphabetical, age of, 58.

R.

Reid, Sir Wm. Hamilton's edition of his works, 109.

Relation of Language to Thought, 650.
Religion, Roman Catholic, in Italy, 597.
Reuchlin, Dr. Hermann, on the history of the Jesuits in France, 576.
Rhyme in Hebrew Poetry, 62.
Ribla in Hamath, condition of, 693.
Robbins, R. D. C., edition of Xenophon's Memorabilia, 185.
Robie, Edward, Translation of Hävernick's Introduction to Ezekiel, 435. On Müller's Christian Doctrine of Sin, 499. Early history of the Jesuits, 576. Hävernick's Commentary on the introductory vision of Ezekiel, 700.
Robinson, Edward, D. D., Articles by, 79, 397, 760. On the Depression of the Dead Sea and Jordan Valley, 397. Notes on biblical Geography, 79, 760.
Roman Catholic Religion in Italy, account of, 597.
Roman Literature, Study of, 23.
Romans 5: 12–17, De Wette's Commentary on, 263.
Roscher, Wm., of Göttingen, on the Orations of Thucydides, 481.
Ruad or Arvad, Description of, 251.
Ruhnken's Labors as a Scholar, 29.

S.

Sâfetâ in Northern Syria, 21, 244.
Salemiyeh, 683.
Schaff, Prof. Philip, Essay on the Pelagian controversy, 205. Prospectus of Der Deutsche Kirchenfreund, 395.
Schmitz's History of Rome, 394.
Schott's Treatise on Sermonizing, 731. Importance of a regular plan, 731. Kinds of introduction, 732. Subject-matter of introduction, 734. General rules, 735. Proposition, 737. Transition, 739. Partition, 741. Conclusion, 746.
Sears, Pres. B., on Luther's experience at Erfurt, 519.
Selah, explanation by the Jews, 66. By the Septuagint, 67. Herder, change of tone, 68. Gesenius, as a pause for the vocal performer, 69. Köster, as a strophe-divider, 70. Sommer, as marking the main points in the religious feelings of the Hebrews, 73.
Seleucia, built by Nicator, described, 451.
Sermon, Structure of, 731.
Shedd, Prof. W. T. G., On the Relation of Language to Thought, 650.
Sheizar, 689.
Short, Charles, Greek translation of Psalm 137, 376.
Siedhof, Charles, on Study of Greek and Roman Literature, 23.
Simon, St. Stylites, in Syria, 465.
Sin, Müller's Christian doctrine of condensed, 499.
Sintenis, professor at Zerbst, new edition of Plutarch's Lives, 726.
Society, Advancement of, 358.
Sommer, J. G., Article by on Selah, etc., 58.
Sophocles, E. H., History of Greek Alphabet, 776.
Sorbonne, College of at Paris, 192.
Spiritual Beings, Constitution of, 633. Spirit invisible and intangible, 635. Opinions of ancient philosophers, 637. Relation between property and substance not arbitrary, 639. Intermediate theory in regard to the human soul, 641. Source of the true idea of the soul, 643. Scale of being, 645. Connection of the nervous system and the mind, 647. Some hidden tie between the material and spiritual, 648.
Structure of a Sermon, Schott's remarks on, 731.
Stuart, Prof. Moses, Translation by of De Wette's Commentary on Rom. 5: 12–19, 263.
Studies in Hebrew Poetry, 58.

Study of Greek and Roman Literature, 23.
Swadea, in Syria, 449. Silk trade, 453.
Syria, Travels of Mr. Thomson in, 1, 243, 447. Ruins in described, 257.
Syriac Grammar by Bernstein, 390.
Switzerland, Literary Institutions in, 791.

T.

Tacitus, edition of his Germania and Agricola, 171, 180.
Theudas, alleged anachronism in Acts 5: 36, in relation to his sedition, 409. Theudas as described by Gamaliel, 411. Time of his appearance, 412. Josephus takes no notice of this Theudas, 414. Views of Calvin, De Wette, etc., 415. De Wette charges the author of the Acts as having violated history, 416. But Luke cannot have erred, 417. The error may be in Josephus, 419. Luke and Josephus speak of different men, 421. Argument from the name, 423. A change of name common, 425. Theudas the same as Simon, 427. Other proofs, 429.
Thomson, Rev. W. M., Tour from Beirût to Bahlulîah, 1, 243; from Bahlulîah to Aleppo, 447; from Aleppo back to Abeih on Mt. Lebanon, 663. Tour to Damascus, 760.
Thought, its Relation to Language, 650.
Thucydides, his orations a very difficult subject, 481; finely investigated by Roscher, 482. Great number of his speeches, 483. Relation of the speeches to those really delivered, 485. True relation of the speeches, 487. His orations designed for the character of his audience as well as for the orator, 488. Cleon, 489. Speech at Mantinea, 491. Amusement, 492. Conclusion, 495. Peculiar character of his oratory, 497.
Thucydides, Owen's edition of, 777. The history, when composed, 779. Examination of some passages in the Funeral Oration of Pericles, 781 sq.
Tortosa or Tartoos, Description of, 247.
Tours of Rev. Wm. M. Thomson, 1, 243, 447, 663, 760.
Tripoli in Syria, Condition of, 10.
Turner, William W., Interpretation of Psalm lxviii., 312.
Tyler, Prof. W. S., edition of Tacitus reviewed, 180.

V.

Vine, Produce of in the East, 283. Used for other purposes than making liquors, 285. Green grape and fresh ripe grape, 286. Dried grapes, raisins, preserves, jellies, 287. Pickled grapes and molasses, 288. Boiled must, 289. Grape sugar, 290. Vinegar, raisin-drink, raisin wine, 291. Wine, brandy, 292. Leaves and stalks, vineyards a place of resort, 293. Various uses of the vine, 295.

W.

Wette De, Commentary on Rom. 5: 12—19, 263.
White, Henry K., monument to, 192.
Whiting, Rev. G. B. of Jerusalem, on the site of the Holy Sepulchre, 94.
Williams's China, 393.
Withington, Rev. L., Remarks on a Sermon by Dr. Emmons, 625.
Woolsey, Pres., Remarks on a passage in Plato's Gorgias, 431. On Inscriptions, 586. On Sintenis's edition of Plutarch's Lives, 726.

X.

Xenophon's Memorabilia, Robbins's edition of, 185.

Y.

Yezidees, Visit to by Mr. Laurie, 148. Beautiful scenery, 155. Ungracious reception, 157. Yezidee temples, 159. Character of the monks, 161. Annual feasts, 162. Principal Sheikh, 163. Rites and ceremonies, 165. Religious customs, 167. Opinions, 169.

Z.

Ziphron, ruins of, 685.

B S
v. 5
c. 3
22004
Bibliotheca Sacra, Vol. 5
DATE DUE